

LODGE was an active Member of the delegation. Other conspicuous Republicans were David B. Henderson, of Iowa, Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, and John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania.

The debates of the Fifty-first Congress reflected a transition period in the thought of the Nation. Memories and traditions of the Civil War dominated public sentiment. The animosity aroused, especially by the consideration of the so-called force bill, sometimes affected even the social life of Washington. Gen. Wheeler, of Alabama, and Gen. Grosvenor, of Ohio, did not hesitate to fight the war over again in acrimonious debate on the floor. Happily, the Spanish War furnished an opportunity for both these elements to unite in a common service to the country and put an end to such references to sectional differences in debate in the House of Representatives.

The Hall of the House during this Congress was a wonderful school for a young man. The spectacle of strong men striving together in the performance of difficult tasks, while not calculated to teach good manners perhaps, gave an unparalleled opportunity for the study of human motives and the elements which make for strength of character. Mr. GOODWIN made excellent use of this opportunity. He mastered the duties of his position, showing in the discharge of them an aptitude and tact which was a distinguishing trait of his character.

On March 4, 1891, the Fifty-first Congress ceased to exist, and Mr. Reed was no longer Speaker of the House. Mr. GOODWIN returned to Skowhegan and took up the practice of law. In 1892 he was appointed by President Harrison postmaster of Skowhegan. In 1902 he was elected to the Maine Senate, and was made president of that body, a position equal to that of Lieutenant governor in other States. He was also a delegate to the St. Louis convention, where he was an ardent supporter and trusted friend of Thomas B. Reed. Aside from these political duties and a general interest in the welfare of his town, he devoted himself to his law business.

Of Mr. GOODWIN's professional career at the bar, others will speak more at length. It is enough to say that he was a lawyer of great ability and resourcefulness and among the most prominent in the State.

In 1912 his election to Congress brought us together again as Representatives of neighboring districts of our native State, and during his brief stay here we renewed the association of earlier years. He had definitely severed his connection with the law and it was his purpose to devote to his duties the great ability and experience gained from his years of legal training. Who can doubt that his service would have brought large results and reflected honor both upon himself and those who sent him here? Yet although—

The fame is quenched that I forswore,
The head hath missed an earthly wreath,

Why should a limit be set for service when there are—

So many worlds, so much to do,
So little done, such things to be,
How know I what had need of thee,
For thou wert strong as thou wert true.

O hollow wraith of dying fame,
Fade wholly, while the soul exults,
And self unfolds the large results
Of force, that would have forged a name.

Mr. GOODWIN had many friends throughout his whole life, and they were inconsolable when he could no longer be their leader and friend. The editor of the Independent-Reporter of Skowhegan, Mr. Roland T. Patten, expresses his feelings as follows:

The humble and exalted answer to the same call. We, human atoms that remain, presume to dignity, by a somewhat deeper reverence, one departure more than another. He whose hand has grasped the scroll of fame drops it, all but empty at the last of those things which satisfy a life's ambition, and we note with something more than casual glance 'tis not the callous palm of humble tasks finally unbending from an implement of toil.

That we should thus observe and thus distinguish between our brothers at their dissolution is wisdom's part. By this much we place ourselves above other orders of creation, which note not, when a member falls, whether it be of noble or unpretentious mien. By this longer pause, this reverence more profound, this deeper sigh, we create a prize toward which men all their lives will strive, and in so striving are more like to live worthily and usefully.

A life so striven in and so lived is closed and to it we give this final guerdon of reverence and respect. This we may do eagerly, unhesitatingly, as we shall ourselves be gone before another of like mold shall come among the scenes now occupied by us to claim this justice at the hands of men.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, in accordance with the resolution and the order heretofore adopted, at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, February 22, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 22, 1915.

(Legislative day of Friday, February 19, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Martine, N. J.	Sherman
Bankhead	Hughes	Newlands	Shively
Brady	James	Oliver	Simmons
Brandegree	Jones	Overman	Smoot
Bryan	Kenyon	Owen	Sterling
Burleigh	Kern	Page	Stone
Burton	La Follette	Penrose	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lane	Perkins	Thomas
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Pittman	Thompson
Fall	Lodge	Pomerene	Tillman
Fletcher	McCumber	Root	Warren
Gallinger	McLean	Saulsbury	White
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Works

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was requested to announce that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] has been detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], owing to illness.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 21201. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916; and

H. R. 21328. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the life and public services of Hon. Augustus O. Bacon, late a Senator from the State of Georgia.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the life and public services of Hon. Forrest Goodwin, late a Representative from the State of Maine.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 2335. An act to provide for the register and enrollment of vessels built in foreign countries when such vessels have been wrecked on the coasts of the United States or her possessions or adjacent waters and salvaged by American citizens and repaired in American shipyards;

H. R. 17122. An act for the relief of John Burrows;

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 17765. An act to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department;

H. R. 17982. An act to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement;

H. R. 18172. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind.; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators, this is more than a red-letter day in the calendar of the Republic. It is a sacred date in the calendar of constitutional liberty. It does not lessen the honor and esteem in which public men should be held to-day if the people of the Republic turn backward to the beginnings of our institutions to show their love and veneration and

respect for those who had sounded all the shoals and depths of civil government, and who discovered the great and basic principles upon which alone republican government could be founded. The world stands amazed not only at the patriotism and devotion of George Washington but at the wonderful intuition which he displayed as to the dangers which might come with age to this Republic of ours.

In accordance with the custom and the order of the Senate the Farewell Address of the first President of the United States will now be read by the senior Senator from New York, Mr. Root.

Mr. ROOT read the address, as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive Government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you at the same time to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection of the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety, and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed toward the organization and administration of the Government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me, and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guaranty of the plans by which they were

effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which can not end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes in different ways to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The East in a like intercourse with the West already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and what is

perhaps of still greater consequence it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one Nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union all the parts combined can not fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations, and what is of inestimable value they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western—whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You can not shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the Executive and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, toward confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political

systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the Nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Toward the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what can not be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of Governments as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and, remember especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours a Government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a Government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the Government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit unfortunately is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual, and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind—which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight—the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption,

which finds a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern. Some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object—which is always a choice of difficulties—ought to be a decisive motive

for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes, perhaps, the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence—I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens—the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith—here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences, consulting the natural course of things, diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants and to enable the Government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our Nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism, this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest to take, a neutral position. Having

taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity toward other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after 45 years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love toward it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES, 17th September, 1796.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask unanimous consent out of order to submit a report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 6493) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge in the fifth judicial circuit of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1017) thereon.

SHELDON S. S. CAMPBELL.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. McLEAN. I ask unanimous consent for the entry of an order for the withdrawal of papers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be received.

On motion of Mr. McLEAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Sheldon S. S. Campbell, Senate bill 5085, Sixty-third Congress, second session, be withdrawn from the Senate files, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 953).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 18th instant, a statement of the balances to the credit of the respective river and harbor projects of the country now under improvement remaining unexpended and available on January 1, 1915. The Chair believes that this is a matter the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] desired. So the Chair lays it before the Senate. It is a communication from the Secretary of War, with reference to unexpended balances for river and harbor work.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that the communication be printed. That has been the usual course. It is not of very great length and will be useful for the Senate.

There being no objection, the communication and accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ANILINE COLOR INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 952).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, certain information relative to the supply of dyestuffs for American textile and other industries, which, on motion of Mr. SMOOT, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

NORFOLK (VA.) NAVY YARD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$50,000 for building slip, navy yard, Norfolk, Va., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WATER-POWER SITES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, acknowledging the receipt of the resolution of the Senate of the 13th instant, relative to the ownership and control of the water-power sites in the United States, and stating that the desired information will be transmitted to the Senate at the earliest possible date, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year ended December 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, Frank M. Rood, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the within resolution, to wit, House joint resolution No. 5, was duly passed by the 1915 session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, and that the same is now in full force and effect.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, this 18th day of February, 1915.

[SEAL.]

FRANK M. ROOD, Secretary of State.

A joint resolution to accept the provisions and benefits of the Smith-Lever Act of Congress, approved by the President May 8, 1914.

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota:

SECTION 1. Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed an act, approved by the President May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture"; and

Whereas it is provided in section 3 of the act aforesaid that the grants of money authorized by said act shall be paid "to each State which shall by action of its legislature assent to the provisions of this act": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the assent of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota be and is hereby given to the provisions and requirements of said act, and that the State treasurer of the State of South Dakota be and is hereby authorized and empowered to receive the grants of money appropriated under said act, which agricultural extension work shall be carried on in connection with the State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts in accordance with the terms and conditions expressed in the act of Congress aforesaid.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of a certain concurrent resolution adopted by the Fourteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, and the whole of such resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State, at the capitol, in the city of Bismarck, this 16th day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.]

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

A concurrent resolution (Turner).

Whereas when North Dakota was admitted to statehood the State was given for State institutions by the Federal Government lands aggregating 500,000 acres. This land was divided among the various State institutions, and as these lands are sold the moneys derived from them go into a permanent fund, the income of which is used and shall be used for the maintenance and support of the institution for which these lands stand as an endowment; and

Whereas there is in North Dakota to-day about 700,000 acres of vacant Government land remaining, much of which is subject to the 320-acre homestead, and may be subject to a homestead entry of 640 acres provided a bill now before Congress shall be enacted into law; and

Whereas if this shall be done, the remaining public lands in North Dakota will only provide a little over 1,000 homesteads; and Whereas if Congress should enact a law giving to every public-land State 500,000 acres of the remaining vacant public lands in the various public-land States, thereby benefiting all of the people of those States, and in a way in which and by which they would derive a much greater benefit than were the lands open for homesteads to a few: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully request and petition the Congress of the United States, through our Senators and Representatives of Congress, that a law be enacted so that the States receiving these public lands shall be authorized through their legislatures to distribute the lands so given between the penal, charitable, and educational institutions of the State, but providing that one-fifth of the lands so given shall be set aside by the legislature as an endowment fund, the interest from which, when the lands shall have been sold, to be used for the purpose of building roads and bridges in the various States.

A. P. HANSON,
Speaker of the House.
ALBERT N. WOLD,
Chief Clerk of the House.
J. H. FRANE,
President of the Senate.
M. J. GEORGE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing to interfere with the present practice of issuing Government stamped envelopes bearing printed return requests, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against a change in the present system of promotion of postal clerks, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of stop-watch and time study of employees, etc., at the Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 7688) for the relief of Augustus P. Reynolds, which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newman, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SWANSON. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 20975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1021) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 20150) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and I submit a report (No. 1022) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bill and joint resolution, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 15215. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to adjust and settle the shortages in certain

accounts of said District, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1019); and

S. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a joint select committee to investigate and report as to the proper proportion of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia which shall be borne by said District and the United States, respectively, and as to the necessity of any change or revision in the tax laws applicable to said District (Rept. No. 1020).

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 7696) granting an increase of pension to George W. Adams (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7697) granting a pension to Catharine A. Allen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7698) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Alling (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7699) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte A. Avery (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7700) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Babcock (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7701) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Banning (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7702) granting an increase of pension to Abbie C. Boardman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7703) granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Bowers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7704) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Chappell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7705) granting an increase of pension to Martha Connor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7706) granting an increase of pension to Martha Crumb (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7707) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Daniels (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7708) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. De Forest (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7709) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Geer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7710) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Hall (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7711) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hayes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7712) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Hovey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7713) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Jackson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7714) granting an increase of pension to Mary Moriarty (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7715) granting an increase of pension to Nellie R. Palmer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7716) granting an increase of pension to Elsie A. Platt (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7717) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Playfoot (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7718) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Semple (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7719) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide M. Tarbox (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7720) granting an increase of pension to Mary Whipple (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 7721) granting a pension to Ella Webster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7722) granting an increase of pension to Charles Thurston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 7723) authorizing the Texarkana Board of Trade to construct a bridge across the Red River between Fulton, Ark., and Index, Tex.; to the Committee on Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION OF SUBMARINES.

Mr. SMOOT. I offer an amendment to the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20975), and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There being no objection, the amendment was read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

On page 48, line 1, strike out "one" and insert "fifty"; line 4, strike out "eleven" and insert "twenty-five"; line 5, strike out

"\$2,305,000" and insert "\$30,000,000," so that the paragraph will read as follows:

"Fifty submarines, to be of seagoing type, to have a surface speed of not less than 20 knots, to cost exclusive of armor and armament not exceeding \$1,400,000 each; and 25 submarines, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$550,000 each, and the sum of \$30,000,000 is hereby appropriated for said purposes to be available until expended."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 21201. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 21328. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 20347, the Army appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I had intended at this time to make some observations with reference to the present situation and condition of our military establishment, but because of the shortness of the time which intervenes between now and the 4th of March I have felt that I would be recreant to my duty if I devoted any time to the discussion of these matters, further than to say that there are those in our country who would violate the letter and spirit of Washington's Farewell Address, just so ably read by the distinguished Senator from New York, wherein, after speaking of the necessity of maintaining the Union of our people, he said:

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined can not fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is that your Union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

There is existing to-day, Mr. President, the same unity of heart and purpose in our country, in the North and in the South, in the East and in the West, which existed at the time of that farewell address. There is no more reason to-day for the maintenance of a large standing army than there was at that time, if we follow out the further suggestion of that address and abstain from entangling alliances with other countries of the earth. I think I can safely say that we have been enabled to do that through the efforts of patriotic Presidents.

I think I am able to prophesy that we will be able to do it in the future through the patriotic efforts of the present patriotic President and those who are to follow, and while there are some things that need to be done with reference to our military establishment, there is absolutely no need to meet the fears of the timid in this country by the establishment of a large standing army. There is a middle ground between those who insist upon a small standing army, insufficiently officered and manned, and those who insist upon the maintenance of a large one.

It was as an advocate of a medial course in this country that I had intended to say something to the Senate to-day, but I propose to wait until some future occasion to address myself to the subject when legislation may be considered maturely. There is some legislation that is sorely needed, but the shortness of the present session has made it impossible to suggest it. There is some that I am sure will be enacted at the next session of Congress to meet the needs of the Army and make efficient not a large standing army but make most efficient an army of not to exceed 125,000 men. With such an army, properly officered, and an efficient national guard as a nucleus and the establishment of a reserve, which can be created with little, if any, expense to the country, there is no question but that we will be in a position to meet all dangers that are likely to come upon us from foes without or within.

Now, Mr. President, with this short observation upon the subject, and regretting that I do not feel it proper to go into

the whole subject at this time, I will ask that the formal reading of the bill now before the Senate be dispensed with; that it be read for amendment; and that the committee amendments be first considered and acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with; that it be read for amendment; and that the committee amendments be first considered? The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that much has been said in both Houses, principally in the House of Representatives, concerning the need of the establishment of a large military and naval armament, I feel it my duty, notwithstanding the value of our time, to address the Senate upon that subject for about 20 minutes.

Mr. President, last summer, with the swiftness of thought, seven nations of Europe became involved in war. The population of the countries engaged were transformed into belligerents before they were fully conscious of the fact. Peace fled on the wings of the morning. The wheels of commerce and industry came to a halt with a suddenness that shook the foundations of the industrial world. Great armies sprang into being overnight. Civilization stood aghast at the change which reversed the hands upon the dial of progress and menaced the overthrow of all her great achievements. All that science had accomplished in three centuries was pressed into the science of slaughter and destruction. The mightiest nations of the Old World abandoned their pursuits and grappled in grim and deadly conflict on land, on sea, and in the air. For six months the contest has raged, spreading death and desolation everywhere, and no man may say what the end will be.

Mr. President, until this terrible upheaval occurred many of us had cherished the hope that war's arbitrament was a horror of the past; that reason had substituted the principles of enlightened justice for the sword; and that the gravest of national differences were amenable to adjustment through the bloodless processes of a wise diplomacy. Republican government had established itself firmly in the Western Hemisphere, the force of whose example had been impressed upon the peoples of every land. Commercial intercourse had knit the nations together with a network of mutual interests, and their interdependence for the necessities and comforts of modern industrial life had become the established consequence of international trade. The sword had been more than beaten into a plowshare; it had been molded into the telegraph wire, the steel rail, the machine drill, and the prow of the merchantman. Ours seemed to be the age of constructive development, material and intellectual. The genius of men found its loftiest expression and their ambitions its greatest triumph in the pursuit of commerce, of the industries, and of science in all her manifold phases. The engineer had been substituted for the soldier. The armed camp still abounded in eastern monarchies, but the huge expense of militarism apparently condemned it to an early death.

For an hundred and twenty-five years the American Republic had maintained itself without a large standing army. The conviction that liberty could not coexist with such an institution had steadily grown. We had prevailed in two wars with a foreign enemy, and had fought to a finish our internecine controversy without overcoming or impairing our prejudice against great military establishments. And we have kept our naval force within comparatively modest limits. Our isolation, our freedom from alliances, entangling or otherwise, with other powers, and our moral influence in the affairs of men at the close of our first cycle of national life confirmed and vindicated our policy in so far as our conceptions could determine.

In one instance we had made an innovation upon a general feature of defensive strategy. We covenanted with Great Britain that no naval force save such as might be required for safeguarding the revenues, should be maintained by either nation; a pact which has been well observed for nearly a century. Since the convention of April, 1817, the common frontier has stretched from ocean to ocean, and with a careless unconsciousness of the peril which is now vociferously asserted with the vigor of a fire alarm we have not safeguarded it with a single blockhouse.

We have been equally remiss upon our southern border, which is also transcontinental, where nothing but an occasional customhouse intervenes between ourselves and Mexico. Moreover, continuous lines of railway have been constructed from our own into the foreign domains north and south; and these are operated by private owners without governmental interference beyond what is necessary for the enforcement of our tariff laws. We have thus contributed both actively and passively to a situ-

ation, the frightful potential consequences whereof are now suddenly revealed to us.

The European war has rudely disturbed our reposeful sense of security. It has reminded a large portion of the public as with a blow in the face that ours might have been—as it may soon be—the fate of Belgium. To them our peril is so great, because of our lack of precautionary defensive measures, that it may be difficult to strengthen our exposed frontiers and coast line before the shock of its arrival is upon us. Although we have expended billions upon our Army and our Navy within the last 20 years, the deficiencies of both are said to be as lamentable as though the expenditures had not been made. It has inspired makers of armor plate and military equipment the world over to magnify our helplessness and to advertise their facilities to supply all needed armament in quantities demanded by the unprecedented emergency.

What is this peril, the breath of whose presence we can actually feel? Whence comes it, and why does it menace our Nation so directly? If imagination can body forth a thing unseen, I should declare it to be a long-cherished purpose of the nations now at war across the Atlantic, or some of them, and of another great nation across the Pacific, because of our unpreparedness for war, to direct an expedition, or several of them, consisting of vast bodies of trained veterans, fully equipped with all the modern machinery of war, to ravage our shores, burn our cities, murder our men, ravish our women, and levy tribute upon us or take final possession of our country by right of conquest; that they will come without warning and without provocation merely because we are defenseless, and because they are red with the lust of plunder. It may be England, because she has a great navy; Germany, because she has a great army; Japan, because she is said to have a grievance; or it may be all of them together. But the great central fact to be gathered from the apprehensions of men is that they, or some of them, or one of them, or some other power, are—

Coming as the winds come when forests are rended;
Coming as the waves come when navies are stranded.

And that we, fervently thanking Providence for restraining the invasion thus far, will make it certain by any postponement of an armed defensive preparation. And as we are assured that this formidable unknown but positively identified menace is inevitable, so are we also told that the blow may fall anywhere, everywhere. England may launch it across our northern border, in conjunction with her Asiatic ally. They have access to the Canadian ports and in that way can mobilize against us with impunity. Canada has marshaled her legions for the German foe; how easy to utilize them for a drive over the unprotected border when they come marching home again.

We are also warned that Japan contemplates a strike at us through Mexico, with whose late ruler she was most friendly. This would avoid the feeble opposition which might be encountered if a landing were attempted upon our coast line.

Or it may come from the sea. From every direction the danger haunts us. We seem to be surrounded by invisible enemies entertaining visible designs against us. Our plight is not a recent but a chronic one. The glare of Europe's conflagration has merely served to reveal its terrors more clearly, and so the war-equipment trust is here with samples of their wares for our inspection. And the fact that these great military and naval powers are exhausting themselves against each other, that each is put to the supreme test of endurance that it may not be overcome, would seem to be of no importance as regards ourselves. Instead of removing or postponing the common purpose to invade America, it has, according to the alarmist within our midst, served to intensify that purpose and to reveal its real terrors in absorbing perspective. Beset by these sinister conditions, we are admonished to prepare the means for a successful defense against the great powers of the earth. We must do it effectually and we must do it now. We are not united as to the extent to which our defensive preparations must go in order to be efficient, but we are all agreed that efficiency must be the goal. And it is clear that no defensive equipment can be adequate unless it be equal to the emergency which confronts us. The emergency must measure the volume of preparation. It is Japan and also Anglo-Japanese. It is Teutonic. It is Russian. It is Latin. It is the Dual Monarchy. And it may be a union of them all. It is omnipresent and circumambient.

We should be aided in our task by the example of other countries, whose armaments, including those to be utilized for our destruction, were all designed for defensive purposes. They have so declared, not once but constantly. They justify their enormous military and naval expenditures to their subjects

wholly upon this assurance. The nations now at war in Europe are all upon the defensive. Each accuses the others of being the aggressors, and none will acknowledge that responsibility. And their defensive preparations have taxed their resources to the last degree.

We have a longer coast line than any other nation. If it be true that a formidable enemy can land almost anywhere and inflict irreparable damage upon us, then we should fortify and protect the whole of it against the danger or we do not protect ourselves adequately.

If it be true that our Navy, although second only to that of Great Britain, is practically worthless, then we should increase it beyond that of Great Britain. If it be true that Germany with her 42-centimeter guns has designs upon our territory, then we should equip our coast fortifications with 84-centimeter guns. And, of course, I assume all these things to be true, because we have been assured of their truth by the solemn declarations of the American press and by multitudes of circulars and pamphlets scattered through the mails in October, November, and December of every year since 1898. These are the months in which Japan always accommodatingly reveals her designs against our Pacific coast or outlying possessions, and I venture the prediction that if she shall prove to be the foretold invader she will land her forces about 30 days before a regular session of Congress. The consistency of her conduct in this regard is a reflection upon her high reputation for strategy, but she doubtless persists in the habit as a tribute to some oriental superstition and upon the assumption that our lethargy and lack of preparation will continue.

Besides fortifying our coast lines, we should terminate the Rusk-Bagot convention of 1817 and establish a fleet on the Great Lakes. Our defensive policy will demand it. We can terminate that agreement upon six months' notice and begin our naval construction at once. I am mindful of the fact that both Governments conceded in 1817 that the presence of armed vessels on the Lakes would provoke instead of prevent discord, but this minor danger must yield to the demands of the greater peril.

And there is Alaska, with Canada's huge bulk interposed between it and ourselves, and Russia only 36 miles away on the other side, with the Aleutians stretching far westward into the Pacific. Perhaps it is permissible to postpone the fortification of Alaska's eastern frontier until the more pressing needs of our nearer ones are satisfied, but we should not neglect her seacoast. We must construct an Alaskan squadron and fortify and garrison her coast line. Should the Slav vanquish the Teuton in Europe he may determine to reassert his dominion over that region and march his hordes across the frozen waters of Bering Straits while we sit secure in our fancied isolation.

And there are Hawaii and Porto Rico, both tempting morsels to the ravenous appetites of the devouring nations. And the Philippines away off in the Orient which we ravished from Spain despite the protests of Democracy and the warning of our wisest statesmen. If German occupation of Kiaochow menaced the peace of Asia, why does not our possession of these islands tend in the same direction? The world was told in 1900 that we departed from our unbroken policy and invested these islands in the discharge of a great public duty which had been thrust upon us; a duty still existent and whose obligations we are admonished to observe until our subjects there have reached our own moral and intellectual stature. This far-flung outpost demands the most formidable defensive equipment. It is a part of the enemy's country, infested by foes from without and foes from within. Here is need for forts and fleets, for guns and garrisons. It is as though we had extended our coast line by 4,000 miles, taking chances with fate for its conservation.

And there is our Canal Zone across the Isthmus wrested from Colombia in wanton disregard of our treaty obligations and in violation of the sovereignty of a friendly sister Republic. We followed our acquisition by the construction of a great canal designed to serve the needs of commerce and communication for all time. This vast undertaking was conceived and accomplished not for ourselves alone, but for all the nations. It is a great international highway dedicated to the service and welfare of mankind. It is the contribution of the great Republic to the progress of the world. It is ours, but impressed with a trust for the future and for which all generations are the beneficiaries. But we are daily admonished, we have been warned from the beginning, that unless we guard its approaches with impregnable fortifications and batteries of highest power, unless we line its banks with a veteran soldiery and people the sky above its channel with biplanes and dirigibles, the cupidity or vandalism of the nations in whose behalf we expended five hundred millions for its construction may invest and destroy it. If this be true, it is a ghastly

satire on civilization. We may conceive this Nation at war with formidable enemies eager to occupy its territory, to crush its armies, and exasperated beyond endurance by the stubborn resistance they encounter; we may imagine American supremacy in commerce attained through competition with her adversaries so fierce as to provoke reprisals and arouse implacable animosities; but it is difficult to believe a great artery of intercommunication, constructed at enormous expense and open to the vessels and commerce of every country, could be imperiled by the hand of man. But we are warned that it is so, and that the gift of our Nation to the world must be guarded by the giver against destruction by some of its beneficiaries; that our act of unexampled generosity has entailed a great and permanent burden upon us, if what has been dedicated to the use of man shall escape his destructive frenzy. And the wonder is that our credulity accepts this libel upon our race as true and clamors for canal fortifications costing almost as much as the waterway, which shall be impregnable to the assaults of armies and navies.

Mr. President, I can not deny to my country the right of self-preservation, nor avoid the duty, as one of its representatives, to extend it every facility which the task demands. I solemnly affirm that if we are subject to formidable foreign invasion we should make preparations against it upon a scale commensurate with the danger. And it is self-evident that a partial or half-hearted scheme of national defense is little better than none at all. Modern warfare is not conducted with small establishments or upon a limited field. It is colossal, deadly, all embracing. It means the discipline of millions of soldiers; the building of huge fleets; the accumulation of vast stores of ordnance, of food, and all the paraphernalia of military equipment; the construction and command of effective lines of communication; the possession of scores of aeroplanes and dirigibles; the maintenance of a competent bureau of information; the possession of many scores of motor trucks and motor cycles. To be defensively secure we must be offensively prepared. We must be stronger than the strongest force we have reason to fear, or we may be overwhelmed.

Let us have no illusions on this subject, for they may be fatal. He who seriously believes that war will come to us indulges in idle chatter when he demands a standing army of but 150,000 men and a reserve force of half a million, an occasional fort along our coast line, and but three or four new battleships annually. We must arm against the only nations we have reason to suspect, and whose prowess excites apprehension. They are the great powers of the present day.

A man said to me a few days ago, "If Germany wins, we shall be compelled to arm against her." I replied, "If England or Russia win, we may be compelled to arm against them." The one contingency is as probable as the other. If we must arm, then we should arm effectually.

It follows that our national defense requires a fleet at least as powerful as those of Great Britain and France on the Atlantic, and of Japan and Russia on the Pacific, in battleships, cruisers, torpedo boats, submarines, and transports. And our vessels should be superior to them in armor, speed, and gun power.

We should have a standing Army of at least 1,250,000 men and a reserve of twice as many more. A third of the Regulars should be sufficient for our outlying possessions; the remainder would be few enough for the coming continental emergency. To this general land and water equipment should be added a fleet upon the Lakes and fortifications along our boundary and coast lines wherever a landing in force or a drive across the border could be made or expected. We should have not less than 2,000 aeroplanes and 250 dirigibles, 25,000 autotrucks and 10,000 motor cycles. The Government should take over all armor-plate, rifle, powder, and small-arms manufactories and erect as many others as the demands of our defensive preparation require. It should also take over the entire transportation system of the country and operate it exclusively with reservists. Only in this manner can lines be constructed to strategic points where they do not now exist and be devoted exclusively to mobilization when war is declared. Not otherwise can they be operated with certainty and safety. Even now it is asserted by our alarmists that our privately operated roads are lined with Asiatic trackwalkers and section hands commissioned to destroy them the moment hostilities begin. And the telegraph and telephone lines must be nationalized as well.

We must establish a bureau of intelligence. Canada, Great Britain, and Italy, Germany and France, Japan and Russia must be sown with American spies to pilfer information through back doors and intrigue, to purchase it from corrupt officials and eavesdropping accomplices. We must encourage and reward betrayals of trust, the manufacturers of lies, and the violation of confidences. In a word, we must emulate if we

would thwart the enemies of our country by duplicating their methods, at whatever cost to our Treasury, our standards of conduct, our national self-respect, and our conceptions of honor and honesty.

And, Mr. President, we should also invest the Almighty with the attributes of a tribal God, a God whose peculiar people we are, who will battle with us and for us when war is upon us; a God who directs our missiles of destruction, who confuses our enemies, who aids us in spreading carnage and destruction among our foes; a God who sanctions and stimulates the slaughter of our opponents, to whom their widows and orphans may not turn for relief; a God who rides our battle storm and speaks in the thunder of our cannon; a God who reveals his face to us alone, who hides his countenance from those who war against us, who justifies our deeds and applauds our virtues.

Mr. President, the Omnipotent power which guides the sword in the hands of the German Emperor is not the power which bade the Czar go forth and destroy him. That to which England appeals in her great extremity possesses attributes vastly different from those investing the Jehovah before whom Francis Joseph bows in supplication. Each transfigures the same ideal into an image of its own, and that image is clothed in the habiliments of nationality. We shall do likewise, albeit unconsciously, just as soon as we enter upon the task of defensive preparation upon a scale at all commensurate with the danger depicted.

You tell me this is militarism. I grant it. It is navalism too. But where is our alternative? During the past 10 years we have appropriated over a thousand millions of dollars for the Army and for fortifications, and more than twelve hundred millions for the Navy, of which 85 per cent have been expended under Republican administrations, and you are appalled by what you affirm to be an utterly helpless condition. We have the second navy in the world, and you tell us it is nothing. We are isolated by 3,000 miles of ocean from our nearest antagonist, but you say that is no longer a protection. I have taken your premises and sought to trace the inexorable logic of its requirements.

In 1908 Representative Tawney, of Minnesota, then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, declared that the Government was then expending in preparation for war and on account of wars past 67.5 per cent of its total revenues, exclusive of appropriations for the Postal Service. He also said that we were annually expending in the aggregate for these purposes a greater sum than England, France, or Germany, the percentages of these countries being 42.2, 32.2, and 42.9, respectively. And Mr. Tawney did not include certain overhead charges in his estimate which raised our total of expenditures for these purposes to 71 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. Before the Senator leaves the unpreparedness of our country, which has been so elaborately discussed here and elsewhere and in all the papers, I wanted to ask him if he had taken into consideration what would happen to us in our unprepared state if Villa, the bandit in Mexico, could read and thus discover how easy it would be for him and one or two or half a dozen of his fellow bandits to come across the country and not only destroy the country but capture Washington?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. President; I have considered that. I have considered also how easy it would be for the people of Canada, who might be aroused to the height of passion by some untoward incident, to invade us from that direction.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not understand why they do not do it, because they can read, but I understand Villa can neither read nor write, and he does not know how easy a job he would have to capture this country.

Mr. THOMAS. Perhaps it is because he can not read and write that he does not know how helpless we are.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is right.

Mr. THOMAS. That is possible.

Mr. NORRIS. If he could read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he would be up here in two weeks.

Mr. THOMAS. If our condition were as entirely helpless and hopeless as the advocates of militarism would have the world believe—and I say that in a perfectly respectful sense, because I think men who desire and who feel the necessity for a greater equipment are unconsciously perhaps militarists—that condition, however, has existed for years, but the marvelous thing is that with the expenditure of millions upon millions and of billions of dollars for defense we are in the good year 1915 as unprepared and as helpless as we were before that expenditure was made.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. In view of the very great preparedness of the European countries and the great calamities which have befallen those countries in their prepared state is the Senator quite ready to say that our unpreparedness is an unmixed evil?

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has anticipated what I will say before I get through.

But 29 per cent of our national revenues are therefore available under present conditions for the manifold activities of Government exclusive of its military and naval requirements. Agriculture, commerce, manufactures, mining, education, public improvements, the administration of justice, navigation, all these subjects combined, are conducted upon less than a third of the national income, that wars which were and wars which may come may take their toll. And now we learn that all these past expenditures have been made in vain, that our outlay has gone for nothing, and that we must multiply the burden tenfold if we would not perish from the earth.

Mr. President, this means militarism, perhaps not immediate, but certain. For those who profit by the system, who make merchandise of wars and rumors of wars, who stimulate, because they benefit by, the apprehensions of the timid, who make an asset of the martial spirit of our youth, who suggest and promote strife between nations that they may arm each against the other, who coin blood and tears and misery into dividends, will persist until we have exhausted our national resources in creating and continuing military and naval armament for what they term necessary defensive purposes. They think war, breathe war, preach it through the press, and find much response among the good people of the land. These have the vast profits which over twenty-two hundred millions of the past decade have yielded; they will reap that which the coming harvest of thrice that sum will surely yield.

And, Mr. President, when we are at last prepared, fully prepared, we will attack that we may defend. No man thoroughly armed for defense ever failed in time to seek, if he did not encounter, the adversary against whom his defense was directed, or failing to find him has found another. In all history nations thoroughly prepared for defense have been drawn sooner or later into the toils of war. No nation has ever thus equipped itself without arousing resentments and suspicions which find expression in counter armaments. Preparation breeds preparation and finds justification in seeking if it does not otherwise encounter armed conflict, always baptized as defensive warfare. "What is the use of our army," complained the German crown prince shortly before the present war began, "if it is not employed"? This great Republic, the refuge of freedom and the home of popular government, can not escape the fate or the future of monarchies, once it fully embarks upon the policy of militarism, by whatever name it may be christened.

We can secure the money, Mr. President. Every protectionist in the land will tell us how. We can multiply the injustice of the Payne-Aldrich bill manifold; we can quadruple our excise dues and our income tax; we can lay tribute upon hearths and windows, upon salt and sugar. What boots it when national salvation is in the balance? What boots it when posterity, in whose behoof it is to be done, must pay the toll? There will be the awful burden, because theirs is the benefit. It is they whom we safeguard against the storms looming, always looming, on the horizon. And it is a debt which, reaching a sum that the existing civilization can not sustain, must eventually produce the catastrophe it was created to prevent.

Mr. President, I have spoken upon this subject in no spirit of levity. I do not believe this Nation to be in any danger of invasion, but I am conscious of the fact that a vast number of my countrymen do believe it. I know that a great propaganda, promoted for years, and never more vigorously than now, to foster and extend that belief is animated by the sordid spirit of avarice and greed—a spirit which justifies old Dr. Johnson's celebrated definition of patriotism, a spirit which knows neither nationality nor politics, a spirit whose pernicious activities are largely responsible for the awful campaigns of the hour. I want, if I can, to impress upon those who, candidly apprehensive, clamor for a "state of preparedness," are lending themselves and their fears to its accomplishment, that this policy once begun will know no turning, will transform the Republic into a military Nation, and exhaust its resources in the creation and support of vast organizations for so-called defensive warfare, undermine our institutions, reverse our purposes, bankrupt our Treasury, and culminate in the awful tragedy of destructive and devastating war. The way to avoid the result is to reject the policy.

This does not require nor justify a resort to the other extreme. A small standing Army should be maintained as heretofore, but made more efficient. A trained citizenry has many advantages, not all of which are military. The discipline of youth is the best assurance of respect for authority and confidence of the individual in himself. A coast defense kept at an efficiency of 100 per cent is obvious. Our Navy is large enough for the present and far too large if it is as antiquated as its critics contend. This is the day of submarines and dirigibles. Battleships, like other leviathans, belong to an age that was. But let us not be deluded by the false cry that the Philistines are upon us into imitating those countries which have exhausted themselves and piled mountains of debt upon their posterity in the mad competition of militarism under the pretense of defensive preparation. It is a policy which carries within itself the seeds of its own undoing, seeds which must ripen into life and bring their certain harvest of ruin and desolation upon all the sons of men.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Colorado, I should judge from his remarks, thinks that unless this country is willing at once to increase its military establishment to the point where it would be successful over the largest military establishment of any foreign power it ought to do nothing at all. The Senator seems to think that unless we are prepared immediately to maintain an absolutely invincible Army and Navy, it is, as he phrases it, "idle chatter" to talk about taking any measure to increase the efficiency of our Army or our Navy.

Mr. President, I am not a military man. I know nothing about the details of the service. I am not in any sense an expert. I had some slight service upon the Committee on Naval Affairs when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, but I do not think that for at least a sufficient understanding of the question of national defense and national preparedness it is necessary that a legislator should have a technical military education.

To my mind the question before us appears to be a question of common sense. A man does not need to be a graduate of Annapolis or West Point, I take it, to have an opinion as to whether it is the duty of this country of 100,000,000 people to sit helpless and undefended, offering itself as a fat and easy prey to whatever cormorant or predatory nation may take it into its head to attack us, or whether this country shall obey the mandate of the Constitution of the United States and maintain an "adequate" Army and Navy, not with any idea of immediate war, either of offense or defense, but, as I regard it, with the same common-sense view that a city would maintain an adequate police force.

Mr. President, it is well enough to talk about universal peace. In view of the developments over the world during the last three or four years, I consider it to be "idle chatter" for anybody to talk now as though the public opinion of the world had arrived at that state of beatitude where the Sermon on the Mount could be translated into national action. It seems to me to be perfectly preposterous, not only idle but criminal, for grown men who know the history of this country, who know how we have established our institutions, how our fathers in ancient times and in modern times have had to fight with the strong arm to maintain what they thought was right and to maintain the very life of the Government of this country.

I am not discussing what ought to be. I am not discussing what may happen thousands of years hence, perhaps, when all the rest of the races of the world have been educated to the point of Christianity and the kindness and sweetness which ought to characterize people if they practice what they preach. I am talking about existing conditions, and for one I do not propose to sit here silent and quiescent with the pillars of the temples of the world smashing and tumbling all about my ears and lull myself to sleep with any dolce far niente talk about universal peace and sympathy and the concordance of nations. That, Mr. President, I regard almost in its effect, though, of course, not in its intention, as treason to this country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. With pleasure.

Mr. THOMAS. I assume that the last remark of the Senator was due to the remarks which I have just submitted to the Senate. While I recognize that the Senator draws the sting from his remark by declaring that such was not the intention, I can not permit it to pass by without protesting against its application to that large number of men and women throughout this country who are now, as they have been for years,

devoting their lives and their energies to the cause of universal peace. It may be that they are subject to the charge of cowardice, which is sometimes brought against every man who styles himself a pacifist, but I am not one of those who think those who cry peace in the world instead of war can be guilty of treason to their own country and their own Government. It is true that the pillars of the temples of the other nations are now tumbling and many of them are falling. It is due to us to do what we can to temper the blow, but that we should immediately get ready by imitating and following the example of those whose policies have brought about this terrible result would seem to me to smack more of treason than the action of those who, seeing this example, would try to avoid it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Colorado may possess his soul in patience in the serene consciousness that I had no reference whatever to him or to the remarks which he has made. I succeeded him on the floor in point of time, and I take the other view of the question of national preparedness, as I understand it, from what he has expressed.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not doubt the Senator is perfectly sincere and entirely patriotic in the view which he entertains of existing conditions as they exist for increased naval and military equipment, and I am sure that his sober second thought will approve the suggestion that the same charity of sentiment and intention should be extended to all the sons of men.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly; Mr. President, I have nothing but the kindest feelings for the Senator from Colorado, and also for all the people who are engaged in a great propaganda of peace. I do not, as I have said, question their patriotism. I do not question their courage. If this country were attacked I believe they would fight as valiantly in its defense as anybody who advocates an adequate preparation for defense now, without waiting until the emergency and the hysteria arise; but I say, if I be correct, it is better to be prepared than to be unprepared; when the emergency arises it is better to have an armament of completely trained and competent men and officers, both on land and sea, than it is to appeal in hysterical tones to the country for two or three millions of men gathered from peaceful pursuits and attempt to make a disciplined army out of an unorganized mob. I say, if it is better to be prepared than to be unprepared, prepared for whatever may come, hoping that nothing but good for us will come, then the view I take of this matter is a safer and a sounder view for this country than the view of those who say that because we are not at once to plunge into military preparation exceeding that of any foreign power, therefore they will sit supine and do nothing. I may be wrong in that opinion, but I regard it as in accordance with my oath of office and my responsibility as a Senator of the United States to warn this country that in my view they have been and are living in a fool's paradise.

I do not believe, in the present temper of the world, with what we have seen in the Orient, in Europe, in Mexico, north and south and east and west, that it does us any good or is any credit to our intelligence to sit and fold our hands and talk about the beauties of beating swords into plowshares and setting a good example to people who are so enraged that they are engaged in the genial occupation of cutting each other's throats and blowing up the vessels of neutral powers in addition to those of belligerents. I do not believe it is of any use to talk about the beauties and the blessings of universal peace. I should consider myself a candidate for a madhouse if I should undertake to shape the policy of this great Nation upon any such conception as that.

Mr. President, I started by saying I am not a military man. This is not a military question so far as we are concerned. It will be, if we adopt the common-sense, national patriotic policy, a military question for military experts to carry out the details, but it is a question of common sense, of common ordinary sanity, in my opinion, to open our eyes and to view things according as your senses convey the events that are proceeding about us to a normal brain.

Mr. President, there has been for several months a spirit of inquiry in this country to ascertain exactly what is our condition both as to the Army and the Navy. Various attempts have been made in another branch of this Congress to ascertain merely the facts. We are not allowed to do so. The condition is suppressed. Wherever a man having the knowledge competent to discuss the situation and to tell the country what it is, no matter how high or how low in rank, either in the Army or the Navy, if he venture to make a talk to a few friends in a social club, he is called to account and reprimanded by the Secretary either of the Army or the Navy, as the case may be. The men competent to give us the information are officially gagged. The men in Congress who demand it are accused of trying to make trouble for the country. So far as I am con-

cerned I shall not try to make any trouble for the country. All I want is to try to do what I may in my small way to avoid trouble for the country, and if trouble shall ever come, and I trust it may not, I want to be in a position to say at least that I saw the situation and I demanded that proper steps should be taken to ascertain the condition of our military unpreparedness and to correct it.

If I could have my way, I would vote for a thorough inquiry by a joint committee of Congress into the entire question of the military preparedness of this Nation in case it were called upon to defend itself, and as far as I can see there is no reason why anybody should want to oppose that.

It is said that vast sums have been expended in the past upon the Army and the Navy and the coast defense. Of course nobody expected that those branches of the Government would be maintained for nothing. Everybody knows that great guns cost money, and that battleships cost \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 apiece. Everybody knows that they wear out. It might be that if we had remained undefended and impotent, so that we would have had to submit to national humiliation during the last 25 years if any attempt had been made upon us that we were unprepared to resist, that money would not have been spent.

But, Mr. President, if a nation of 100,000,000 people is to be prepared to assert its rights and to defend its flag and its honor and its commerce, it has got to maintain an adequate army and navy, and it costs money. They can not be created upon the instant. We all know that it takes from one to three years to build a battleship of the first class, and that it would be idle to attempt to create a navy after the necessity for its use had arisen; and it would be just as idle to attempt to create an army. We have got always to maintain an adequate army and navy or else we have got to adopt the policy of some of the pacifists—I do not know whether they are entirely agreed upon it—to abolish the Army and Navy. Then we could save the money, and then when Mexico or Turkey or the Barbary pirates, if there be any, cast our citizens into prison and put the torture upon them, whenever any nation has a boundary dispute with us or attempts to use its army or navy in blockading our ports and imposing indemnity upon us, we can preach the sweet doctrine of moral suasion to them and turning the other cheek as an argument that we think it is not in accordance with the spirit of an enlightened age to use these horrible instruments of force against us; that we ought to submit to some kind of an international arbitration tribunal to be organized and sit down and talk it over.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. I notice the Senator has several times expressed his view of the necessity for an adequate Navy and an adequate Army. What in his judgment would be an adequate Navy or an adequate Army?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I think I have heard the Senator ask that same question before. I will say to him that it would depend entirely upon the circumstances. I would say in general terms that nothing would be adequate, no matter how large, either as a naval or a military establishment, that was not properly and proportionately balanced and equipped in every branch of all the auxiliaries of the service, so that, the chain being no stronger than the weakest link, the progress and rapidity of action of a fleet or an Army depending absolutely upon the slowest unit it could be operated perfectly to whatever extent it existed, so that it would not be unbalanced and one-sided and insufficiently supplied with artillery, or with cavalry, or with infantry; that whatever size it was, it would be a perfect instrument of its size; that our Naval Establishment should not be perfect of its size in line of battleships or dreadnaughts or superdreadnaughts and be absolutely deficient in the colliers that furnish those dreadnaughts with coal, so that the humiliating and mortifying spectacle might never again be witnessed, as it was witnessed when our great fleet was sent around the world for the purpose of giving an exhibition to foreign nations of the majesty and power of this Nation, that it would have to be furnished with the fuel by which it navigated from one foreign port to another by the colliers leased from other Governments with whom, if we ever wanted to use our Navy, we might be at war.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut if he does not think it might be interesting to get a definition from the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] as to what an adequate

Navy may be? I find that the Democratic platform of 1912 says:

The party that proclaimed and has always enforced the Monroe doctrine and was sponsor for the new Navy will continue faithfully to observe the constitutional requirements to provide and maintain an adequate and well-proportioned Navy—

And so forth.

I would be very much gratified if the Senator from Ohio would also give his definition of what an adequate Navy is.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield further to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not think I am a dreamer by any means. I am quite willing that there shall be an adequate Navy and an adequate Army, but when I hear a gentleman in the public service using those terms in legislative halls the situation is somewhat different from a general declaration which may be made by a political party. The question is confronting us now, it seems, in conjunction with the Army and Navy bills. When they speak of an adequate Navy or an adequate Army, am I to understand as a legislator that this means an expenditure of \$100,000,000 a year or a thousand million dollars a year? I have heard no one give to me an intelligent declaration on that subject; and, not meaning to get into a controversy with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut or with the distinguished Senator from Washington, it occurred to me that it was quite a pertinent question, in view of the fact that this is under discussion at the present time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I did not want to get into any controversy, either. I was simply desirous of getting for my own information the idea of the Senator from Ohio as to what would be an adequate Army or an adequate Navy. The Senator did not give us any expression of his views as to what an adequate Army or an adequate Navy is.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not, and, of course, it is impossible, as the Senator from Ohio knew it would be impossible, for me now or anybody else to describe in number of vessels or number of men what would be "adequate."

Mr. POMERENE. It was not I who was discussing the question; it was the Senator from Connecticut who raised the question. I have heard suggestions made that we perhaps ought to add 100,000 or 200,000 men to the Army. I do not profess to know, but I take no lesson whatever from conditions as they prevail in the militarism of Europe.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that I am in accord with his views on that subject. There is a contrariety of opinion as to what is necessary to constitute an adequate Army. The Secretary of War, who has given the matter very great consideration, thinks that an Army of 105,000 to 110,000 men would constitute an adequate Army, and I am inclined to agree with him in that opinion; but I think everyone concedes, whether they agree as to the number of men or not, that there ought to be some method adopted in this country for creating and maintaining a reserve that might be called for at any time.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I believe I must decline to yield to a tripartite colloquy, because my remarks will be brief and I should like to finish them.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator permit me simply to make this statement, in view of what he has recited?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well.

Mr. POMERENE. I am not sure that I am ready to accept that; but I have been more impressed with the views as expressed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] in a speech which he made some weeks ago than I have by anything else which I have heard upon the floor of the Senate upon this subject.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am very much gratified if any impression has been made whatever upon this subject in the line referred to by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio did raise the question of what was adequate. I apologize to him. I was addressing the Senate, and the Senator rose in his place and asked me what I thought was an adequate Army and Navy. That is the cause of all this digression.

Now, the Senator will never get a more precise answer to his own inquiry than he will to the inquiry of what is a "reasonable doubt" in a law case. It is the kind of doubt that a reasonable man would entertain on the question, in view of all the circumstances, which simply begs the question. What

would be an adequate Navy now and an adequate Army now would not be adequate if the danger of international complications between our Nation and other nations were greater than it is now. What would be best or what would be the composite judgment of the ninety-six Members of the Senate and the four hundred and odd Members of the House as to what would be wisest to start in with as a proper increase in the standing Army in time of peace is utterly beyond the ability of me or the Senator from Ohio to say. But I have a definite enough notion about it to say this, and I refer, as the Senator from Ohio did upon this subject regarding the Army and the Navy as one military branch of the Government in cooperation and the great arm of the Government, to the masterly address of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] here a few weeks ago.

He showed that with that portion of our Army which we are compelled to maintain in our insular possessions and at Panama excepted, with 100,000,000 people here dependent upon a mobile force of 25,000 men, is not adequate even under existing circumstances for this country. It ought to be increased, but above all we ought to find out to our satisfaction whether what we have as a nucleus is organized upon that basis of elasticity and easy and proper expansion so that it can be even the nucleus of what may be necessary to have if complications should arise.

Now, that can not be unreasonable, it strikes me. No man and no combination of business men in any business of large magnitude, or small, either, would for an instant permit his organization, his force, to be upon a basis where it was not reasonably responsive to the probabilities of the future, and he would not wait until the emergency arose. If his business is liable to expand next year, he would not wait until it had expanded before he had provided for the extension of his organization. I am perfectly satisfied, Mr. President, in my own mind, that if this Congress would only allow itself to hold up to its own eyes what the conditions are of preparedness as to our Army and Navy they would not dare, as trustees of this great country's interests, to allow the conditions to remain any longer as they are now.

Mr. President, anybody who knows nothing more about this Armageddon that is going on in Europe and Asia than he may read in the headlines of the daily press knows perfectly well that those armies are equipped with accessories and auxiliaries of which we are almost barren here in this country.

I refer again to the statistics laid before Congress and in the hope of stirring it to transact and perform its manifest duty by the Senator from Massachusetts. He gave the statistics of an attempted rendezvous for experimental purposes of our submarine fleet, and it was an astounding and a pathetic recital. If a submarine is meant for any other purpose than to steam from one repair shop to another and to go out of commission when there is anything to do in the submarine line, then our submarine fleet at the time it assembled, so that its capacity could be ascertained, was a hospital and an ambulance corps instead of an effective fighting machine. Now, it is easy to find out whether that is so or not.

The Senator from Massachusetts said that it was shown by the official reports. He had had the industry to get them together and extract the facts. If that is so, what is the condition of the rest of our Naval Establishment?

I myself think the Naval Establishment is a great deal better off than is the Army Establishment. I think what constitute our first line—the large battleships—are in good condition, probably, though I think the personnel and the efficiency of the men in action may have deteriorated somewhat; but the country does not want to govern itself upon what I think or what somebody else suspects or what some third party may apprehend. Can there be any excuse for not finding out "where we are at"? That is all the country wants to know.

I am satisfied that if we find out the truth about this matter, and it needs a remedy, Congress will supply the remedy, for I think Congress will want to do what they think is their duty and what the people want them to do. I have no doubt that we have a common-sense people, and I do not think they are relying for their protection upon any resolutions that any peace society is passing or upon any diplomatic assurances of "distinguished consideration" from parties from whom other people may apprehend danger at some time or other.

I think our people want an adequate Army and Navy to protect the peace and good order of the country and to protect our commerce abroad and our flag everywhere. Why, Mr. President, a mobile army of 25,000 men scattered about this country, the Infantry never drilling together or cooperating with the Cavalry, with only a few battalions of each in one fort and a few guns and portions of artillery in another fort, and a few regiments of Infantry scattered about from Gov-

ernors Island to Maine and on the plains of the great West—if you could get them all together, and once operate them together, they would hardly make more than an honorary staff of the German Kaiser; yet Senators and Representatives and peace advocates stand up all over the country and talk about militarism in this country. To my mind it is too absurd to discuss.

Mr. President, I have said a great deal more about this matter, in a more or less random way, than I intended to do; but inasmuch as the discussion of the bill has just begun, I desire to ask the Secretary to read an editorial in the Army and Navy Journal of February 20, two days ago, and two very short editorials from two leading metropolitan newspapers which relate to these questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator if he would not just as soon have these editorials printed in the RECORD as to have them read?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, if there were any great rush I would; but it will take only five minutes, I assure the Senator, to read them. I should like what few Senators have honored me with their attention to hear them, and I know they would not read them if they went into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Army and Navy Journal of Feb. 20, 1915.]

A CALL TO ARMS.

If President Wilson consults his military advisers, he will ask authority from Congress to mobilize an army of 1,000,000 volunteers, not for the purpose of making war but to avoid war by preserving neutrality and maintaining our honor and dignity. Placing a million volunteers under training would amount to a declaration that the United States is preparing to insist upon its rights and resist aggression. It would be a measure of peace, as it might possibly avert the war toward which we are now fast drifting, as every student of military history must see, and it would at least partially prepare us to meet the shock of war if war must come. It would also go far to solve the problem of unemployed labor with which we are contending.

If volunteers responded, the most vigorous policy on the part of the War Department could not prepare them for service in the field within less than a year. To send them into battle earlier would be a repetition of the blunder of the first battles of all of our wars thus far. Without adequate training a volunteer army would be as helpless in defending the Nation against an attack as were the citizen soldiers in defending the Capital against the attack of the British regulars in the War of 1812. The mobilization of volunteer troops at this time could not be construed as a hostile demonstration against any nation. It would only amount to a preparation for future developments in the world-wide war. Switzerland and Holland have mobilized their troops to maintain their neutrality, and similar steps are being taken by Italy. None of these nations is more vitally interested or deeply involved in the European war than is the United States at the present time. The armies of Italy, Switzerland, and Holland are made up of trained soldiers. They are ready for war at a moment's notice, while a volunteer army that would be called out by the President would be composed of recruits in training for future service. This country would only be taking the steps for the creation of an army of defense which should have been taken years ago. Further delay in preparing some measure of defense may be fatal to us.

The necessity for calling out a Volunteer Army is made more urgent because of the peace-at-any-price policy which is being preached so vociferously from the housetops with the tacit, if not with the open, approval of those in authority. Foreign nations not only realize that we are not prepared to defend ourselves, but are under the impression that we never will be. On this account, neither Germany nor Great Britain is giving any serious consideration to the protests of the State Department except in words, and Japan is going ahead with its plans for the domination of China and the Pacific Ocean without considering the wishes or the interests of this country. This is ominous of war, for in the end the belligerent instincts of this country, which are only lying dormant, will be aroused by a realization that our people have been misled by the false theories of the peace fanatics. Have those in authority forgotten how, after the firing upon Fort Sumter in 1861, and again after the sinking of the *Maine* in 1898, war came like a flash out of a clear sky? He who rightly reads the signs of the heavens can see the war clouds once more gathering.

If the President should call for such an army as is proposed, aggressions on the part of the great powers would cease, and is it not time that we showed our teeth? During the present war no one can afford to engage in hostilities with this country, though it is obvious to all that our State Department is not in a position to enforce any of its demands. Every step in the diplomatic controversy between Germany and the allies emphasizes the unpreparedness of this Nation to defend itself against aggression.

The calling out of a million volunteers would be the quickest and most practical way of solving the question of national defense. It would determine whether it is safe for this Nation to continue to depend upon the volunteer system to develop an adequate land force. It would be too late to attempt to raise a large force of volunteers after we had been attacked. As Secretary Garrison in his annual report contended, to concede that it would take six months to train a Volunteer Army is virtually an admission of defeat in a war with any of the great nations, and we are fast drifting toward war.

If this Nation could keep a million Volunteers under arms for a limited period, a foundation could be laid for an adequate land force. The Regular Army and the Organized Militia could be used as a nucleus for the training and organization of the Volunteer Army for a further period, after which the Volunteers could go back to civil life as a real force of reserves. Provision could be made for an annual mobilization of the Volunteers, and they could be kept in condition to be called into the field rapidly. All the questions of equipment and provision of reserve supplies could be worked out by the General Staff of the Army,

and the country could then have something approaching an adequate land force. Not only could the present, but the future needs of the country's defense be provided for at a minimum of expense, and we would have a breathing spell in which to organize a complete system of defense and furnish ourselves with an adequate supply of the munitions of war.

We do not overlook the necessity for strengthening our first line of defense, the Navy, but that is a subject for separate consideration. We limit ourselves accordingly in this statement to what is not only immediately practicable and necessary, but what appeals most directly to popular support.

As to the Regular Army, it is only necessary to suggest that all of the great military reputations gained during the Civil War were gained in the command of volunteer troops, and in numerous cases by men of the age of those who are now serving in the rank of subalterns.

The politics of the matter does not, of course, concern us. But an administration that would act on this advice would secure the approval of the country, which is always quick to respond to bold action. Timid counsels never win applause except from those who are past the fighting age or who are in the smug enjoyment of a prosperity shared by only a minority of their fellows.

[From the New York Times of Feb. 21, 1915.]

GEN. GREENE ON OUR DEFENSES.

The object of Gen. Francis Vinton Greene in his little book called "The Present Military Situation in the United States," which is the subject of an article in the magazine section of the Sunday Times today, is not to excite alarm, not to impress Americans with a sense of danger, not to cause New Yorkers to apprehend a sudden bombardment and invasion of their port by a foreign foe. On the contrary, though he is at pains to state all the facts in the case in a forcible and picturesque way, his purpose is chiefly to promote intelligent consideration of our national defenses. Two Secretaries of War, Mr. Stimson and Mr. Garrison, have failed to interest deeply the people of this country in the defects of our military system; but of late, with thoughts of war forced upon them, the public has given many evidences of awakening interest, and there is no doubt that Secretary Garrison's modest plan to bring the strength of the Army up to the requirements of the law has received general approval. Congress thus far has been disposed to treat the matter lightly, to be guided by false counsels, and to reject plans of essential improvement on the ground of economy, while showing small sense of the need of that desirable quality in their treatment of certain other appropriation bills of larger political significance.

Gen. Greene's prophecy of the invasion is fanciful, of course, but it presents a clear picture of a possible happening. That it will ever occur he does not believe, because he expects the American Nation to arouse its representatives in Congress to wholesome action. We must have on this continent a mobile Army of about 50,000 men, well-officered, apart from the troops we need in our outlying possessions; our coast defenses must be strengthened, scout aeroplanes must be obtained, and intelligent provision made for an army reserve. Also, the disposition too frequently manifested in Congress to retard the normal development of our Navy must be checked.

[From the New York Sun of Feb. 21, 1915.]

SECRETARY GARRISON'S OMISSION.

Secretary Garrison has learned that national defense is a subject of minor interest to the American people. Of course, Mr. Garrison is thinking of the land forces; our Navy, whatever its deficiencies may be, has not been neglected. In a timely article in the Century for March Mr. Garrison says that "it is only in the matter of national defense and the precautions to be taken with respect to it that we find an unwillingness to study the past, face the facts, and do what experience dictates."

In their cities the people demand large police forces, efficient fire departments, and boards of health directed by well-trained medical men. But when it comes to any proposal to provide an adequate Army for the defense of the United States and to make preparations for a war that is not in sight the American people show little or no interest. So declares Mr. Garrison, and he is right. What a great service he would render the country by rousing it from its apathy and making people understand that it is just as necessary for the United States, with its "far-flung" coast lines, to have the means of calling a powerful home-defense Army into the field as to possess a strong Navy of dreadnaughts and submarines. Only publicity, more publicity, and still more publicity can accomplish the miracle.

The Secretary of War makes a beginning in this article, but Army men who have studied the matter thoroughly will hardly agree with him that the piecemeal legislation he proposes is wise because Congress can not be expected to act any comprehensive scheme of organization, such as officers of the General Staff have ready to present to the House and Senate, but which has not yet seen the light, owing to the Secretary's policy of suppression. What Mr. Garrison proposes is an addition of 25,000 men and 1,000 officers to the mobile Army and 10,000 men to the Coast Artillery.

The General Staff experts would like to see an increase of the Army, but they would also like to see the Army properly organized on the division plan, so that it could be expanded both scientifically and rapidly to a war footing in any emergency. As the General Staff has pointed out, "even a small army should be correctly organized as an army." Otherwise, when the call to arms comes political conditions will rule, as in the past, the raising of an army for national defense. Secretary Garrison would have made a better beginning in his appeal to the country if he had also explained the General Staff's draft of a reorganization bill and vigorously urged it. Some day the plan will be taken up and put on the statute book, for reorganization of the Army is absolutely the first essential in any intelligent system of national defense.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, it appears from the latter part of the editorial from the New York Sun which the Secretary has just read that the General Staff has a plan—that it has made recommendations for the increase of our military establishment and, to a certain extent, for its reorganization, and the words in that article fairly imply, I think, that the Secretary of War has suppressed that plan. He may have perfectly good and wise motives for not having transmitted it to Congress; I do not know; but it does seem to me—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think there has been any general plan adopted other than the general reorganization plan of 1912, which has been published in pamphlet form. The Secretary of War may have received some suggestions in that line, but they have not been embodied in the form of a recommendation as yet. I think the Senator from Connecticut does not want to do the Secretary of War an injustice.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, far from it. I used the word "suppressed" because that is the word the newspaper article uses. I accompanied it with a declaration on my part that he may have been entirely justified in doing it if he had done it. But, whatever the fact may be, I have no doubt that the General Staff, Mr. President, which is practically the staff of the Secretary of War, composed of his official expert advisors, have modern, up-to-date views upon the question of what should be done for our Army, and I think very likely some of the notions that they had in the report of 1912, to which the Senator from Oregon has referred, may have been modified by events which have transpired since the 1st of last August in the foreign wars; but I do not know as to that. However that may be, it seems to me that the men who hold the purse strings, the representatives of the people of the United States of America here in Congress, who are obliged to formulate the policy or to adopt recommendations, who are obliged to make the appropriations, and who have to justify them or explain them to their constituents at home, are entitled fairly to every ray of light that can be shed upon this question.

I have seen in the past, when certain people and certain publications referred to the efforts Mr. GARDNER, of Massachusetts, has been making in the House to secure additional information with respect to this whole problem of national defense, it was attempted to be set aside on the ground that it was a political drive upon the administration, or something of that kind. Now, Mr. President, it is needless to say that in our foreign relations political parties cease to exist, at least in this Chamber; and on the question of our Army and Navy I would no more think of playing politics or attempting to take any political advantage than I would upon a religious question. I am sure that every Senator of any political party in this Chamber views the question of the Army and Navy—at the present time, at least—as a very grave question and a question involving the honor and welfare—I will not use the word "existence," because I think this Nation would exist no matter what could be done—but the honor and welfare of this Nation; and anything that I have said or intend to say is utterly without any political idea or any intention to reflect upon the administration.

Mr. President, this administration is not responsible, except in a very small part, for whatever situation may exist in the Army and Navy. It may be responsible, and I think it is, for not giving us the light and advising us to correct the faults that have grown up in both establishments during a long series of years under the administrations of both political parties, but principally under that of the party to which I myself belong.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I have been listening attentively to what the Senator has said, and I agree with him in a great many of the positions he has taken. I wish to say that he is absolutely right when he speaks of the nonpolitical nature of the manner in which the Army and Navy and military matters generally are handled in the Senate. In a somewhat long service on the Committee on Military Affairs I have never seen the time when a bystander could have told the difference between the Members as to what their politics might be by their acts.

Now, as to the information which the Senator seeks, we in the committee have been somewhat confounded—I will not say "confounded," but somewhat confused—because of the changes advocated from time to time by those high in military position. The Senator knows that the General Staff is made up by a detail of officers, and that such officers are changed every year or two—at least a portion of them—and the Chief of Staff is changed every four years or in a less time. I think the chairman of the committee has been at all times ready to increase, and, in fact, we have bills now on the calendar to increase the Army; but that matter must be taken up, of course, in a regular way in legislation. While this does not pertain particularly to an appropriation bill, it is entirely proper to speak of it now and to discuss it, and to urge immediate and substantial enlargement of the Army and Navy, and the Military Affairs Committee itself has gone quite a long way in recommending the increase of the Army in bills which are now on the calendar, and

which I hope will yet be passed during the present session. I know the committee voted nearly as a unit on those measures, and certainly the chairman has been desirous, as I am very glad to testify, during this entire term to get in a position where all confusion would be eliminated, so that we might go, if not to the entire limit that the more enthusiastic adherents desire to go, at least a good long step in the way of increasing both the numbers of the Army and its efficiency.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, Mr. President, I am glad to hear that; and I will say in passing that anything that I have said, of course, I do not intend to reflect upon the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs of either branch of Congress or upon the Members of Congress themselves. I have perhaps expressed myself forcibly, because I feel deeply on this question, and I do not think that it has had the consideration that its primal importance demands.

I think we were entitled to have had during the last two months a committee investigating the situation of the Army and Navy and our national preparedness, so that we could have had the benefit of its investigation and report at the time the appropriation bills for the military and naval service came up. We have not been allowed to do it. I hope that this Congress, if it shall adjourn on the 4th day of March, will not adjourn without appointing some committee of that nature, which during the recess may be considering this tremendously important question, and which may be ready to report to the next session of Congress, whether it shall be the next regular session or a special session, if one happens to be called.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought the Senator had finished.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I shall conclude in a moment. I was about to say, Mr. President, that on this military question I have especial confidence in the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I know that Senator well enough, and I am sufficiently familiar with his position in matters affecting the welfare of this Nation, to know that he has the kind of mind that will refuse to be clouded by the sawdust, feathers, and froth, and the pacificatory words of the people, whose desire is the best mental conception that they can form on a proposition; and I know that, while what he may advocate may not go as far as many others would like to go in the way of strengthening our Army and our Naval Establishment, it will be something, and that—at least, judging by his course and what he says upon this question—it will not be along the line of abandoning ourselves upon the maelstrom of international rapine and murder and drifting helplessly, subject to the first dagger that any international highwayman chooses to implant in the bosom of this Republic.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to say that I thank the Senator from Connecticut very much for his cordial expressions in my behalf. What I rose for, however, was to suggest, without intimating that I cared to limit debate or discussion on this bill, that I shall later on, if it becomes necessary, insist that the Senate continue the discussion of the bill until at least 10 o'clock this evening, if it is not finished before that time. As I have said, however, I have no desire at all to limit any Senator in debate.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks which have been made here, particularly the remarks of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. In our domestic or internal affairs it is very seldom the law-abiding, quiet, peaceable, intelligent citizen from whom we fear any violence upon person or property or against whom we find it necessary to guard society either as a whole or as to its individual members. It is the burglar, the bandit, the murderer, the man without regard for the law, against whom society must guard itself and its individual members.

Yet, Mr. President, within the last few months, even in the State which the Senator from Colorado so ably represents, we have seen it necessary for society to invoke military rule for its own protection. We have seen it necessary to send the military forces under the direction of the President of the United States to the State of Colorado to protect society, not only against those who would ordinarily, as we would think, be the persons against whom we must protect ourselves, but against at least some of the good citizens of Colorado, as it is claimed. And, Mr. President, as a general proposition, it is not against the civilized nations of the world that another nation must be ready to protect itself; but unfortunately, sir, the millennium has not yet come, and we have international burglars, bandits,

and lawbreakers, and at present, as we have seen, we have the greatest conflagration the world has ever known arising among the most highly civilized nations.

What is an adequate Navy or an adequate Army, granting that this country must be prepared to protect itself and to make itself respected, to protect its citizens wherever they may be legally, whether within the boundaries of our own country or elsewhere, if that doctrine is longer to be maintained by this Government? What is an adequate Navy and an adequate Army?

I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has practically answered that question. His answer, to me at least, is satisfactory as to how we are to arrive at the adequate Army or Navy necessary for our purposes. He has answered. We have military experts, and we have had reports from them from time to time; but Congress itself has ignored them for years, has failed to carry out their suggestions, and consequently some of us believe to-day that we have not an adequate Army or an adequate Navy—a sufficient nucleus, as the Senator has said—around which we may gather sufficient forces, sufficiently well armed, to protect ourselves against aggression from either burglars, bandits among the other nations of the earth or civilized countries. We can readily see how it might be possible for this country to become involved in a war, or at least how this country might be compelled to protect its own boundaries against aggression from some of the nations that are now engaged in this great world war.

The Senator from Colorado has said that he has seen the great line extending between ourselves and our civilized neighbor on the north, without fortifications and without soldiers upon it, and that that of itself is to his mind a sufficient answer to all the arguments of those whom he chooses to call militarists. Why, Mr. President, I can see and he can see and every other Senator can see how, if the war should happen to take a certain turn, it might be that very line which would be crossed by those seeking to attack that neighbor of ours on the north. It might be, if we had no adequate Army or Navy for our own defense, that the easiest way in which Canada could be reached by some enemy would be across the territory of the United States.

"Oh, but," it is said, "you need not fear anything of that sort." The same thing was said to Belgium and Luxembourg, that they need fear nothing of that kind.

Mr. President, there is another neighbor to this country—a neighbor to the south of us. Conditions in Mexico at the present time are very similar to the conditions as they existed in 1858. The attention of the Congress was repeatedly called, between the years from 1856 to 1860, to the conditions existing in Mexico, not only with reference to the duty of the United States to some extent to preserve order upon this hemisphere but with reference to the danger which might inure to this country itself if it allowed conditions within the boundaries of our unfortunate neighbor on the south to continue as they existed then. Prophecies were made in this Chamber by Senators from various States that the conditions existing in Mexico as they were at that time might possibly result in dragging this country into a war with a foreign nation.

Had it not been for the fact that from 1860 to 1865 we were engaged in a great civil war, we would have been brought face to face with the conditions which had been prophesied by those speaking here, and by a President of the United States in a message to this body. As it was, unable to carry out the doctrine which we had announced in 1823, and which we have maintained down to the present time, we could only protest against the action of France in sending 18,000 veteran soldiers from her country into Mexico to place Maximilian in Chapultepec upon the Mexican throne. We could not send the armed forces of the United States to back that protest; but so soon as the Civil War was over we did throw 25,000 veteran troops upon the Rio Grande, and notified Napoleon III, as well as the Emperor of Austria, that in the event they did not withdraw the French troops, and did not cease to aid Maximilian in his ambitions, the United States would of itself drive the French out and Maximilian from the throne. Had not that demand of the United States been complied with, the result would have been war between this country and France, growing out of the internal difficulties within Mexico, with which it was said then, as it is said now, that this country has nothing to do.

Mr. President, I for one see the same difficulties staring us in the face to-day that those who spoke here from 1858 to 1860 saw confronting us from Mexican sources at that time. I hope the policy so far followed by this Government with relation to Mexico may not result as the policy of inaction at that time resulted. I hope the time may not come when we may be face to face with the armed forces of some other country upon Mexican soil; but, unfortunately, sir, if this country were to be

dragged into this great war which is sweeping over the world, the point of danger to the United States, the point from which the attack would almost inevitably come upon this country, is Mexico upon the south. There is no power there to prevent the landing of troops. There is no power in Mexico to prevent the overrunning of the entire country by foreign troops, either for the purpose of permanently acquiring territory in that country or for the purpose of reaching us upon our unprotected southern border, for along the southern border of the United States for thousands of miles there are no fortifications and but few armed forces of the United States. There are magnificent harbors upon the coast of Mexico inviting an attack upon this country and railroads reaching from those harbors to our borders; and, as I say, if unfortunately this country were involved in war, in my judgment the attack would come from the weakest point, which is Mexico.

I know that matters of this kind have been considered by some of those interested or involved in Mexican difficulties; and it is a matter of common knowledge, published in the public press of Mexico time and again, repeatedly spoken of openly in public meetings, that negotiations have from time to time been entered into between one or more of the factions in Mexico and foreign countries with which we may at almost any moment be involved in very, very grave international questions.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. KENYON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I have no desire myself for the calling of a quorum.

Mr. KENYON. I know that; still, I think more Senators should be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	James	Norris	Simmons
Brady	Johnson	Oliver	Smith, Ariz.
Brandeggee	Jones	Overman	Smith, Md.
Burleigh	Kenyon	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Camden	Kern	Page	Smoot
Chamberlain	La Follette	Penrose	Sterling
Chilton	Lane	Perkins	Swanson
Colt	Lea, Tenn.	Pittman	Thomas
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Poinexter	Thompson
Fall	Lewis	Pomereac	Tillman
Fletcher	Lippitt	Ransdell	Vardaman
Gallinger	Lodge	Root	Weeks
Gore	McLean	Saulsbury	White
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Williams
Hardwick	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	
Hollis	Myers	Sherman	
Hughes	Nelson	Shively	

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is necessarily absent on business of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent from the sessions of the Senate. I make this announcement and ask that it may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I am aware that I have taken the time of the Senate upon more than one occasion upon some branches of this question, which I consider of such grave interest to the United States. I am further aware that any public man or any Member of Congress who announces himself as in favor of an adequate Army or Navy, or who expresses a sentiment which he intends to be in the nature of what he understands as the duty of the Government to its citizens, or which he intends as an appeal to citizens who may entertain the same views as those entertained by himself, but who, he thinks, may not understand the facts or the circumstances as he understands them—I appreciate the fact that in the eyes of very many good, sincere, earnest people of this country that public servant or public man is viewed as a "jingo" and is spoken of by those who do not agree with him in all matters as one desiring to fasten a policy of militarism upon this country.

Knowing this as I do, and knowing that I have at times trespassed upon the time of the Senate by calling attention for the last three years, since July 22, 1912, upon various occasions, to the conditions which I believe constitute an ever-increasing danger to the future peace and welfare of this country—realizing that and yet knowing conditions as they exist south of our boundary line as I do, believing that some of the

people who should have equal interest and who have equal interest in these questions with myself do not understand them; believing, with due deference to the present administration, that neither the President of the United States nor his Secretary of State understand those conditions or realize their constant, continuing menace and threat to the peace of this country, to the safety of this country, which I see from my standpoint, I shall do my duty as I see it and accept the designation of "jingo" or "militarist" from those who desire to confer such an appellation upon me, because, sir, I think the time has come in the history of this country when the people of the country should obtain information, from whatever source possible, in order that, as I said once before in this body, public opinion in the United States may be informed, and whatsoever action is finally taken by this country may be under the pressure of informed and not inflamed public opinion.

Entertaining these views, and believing, as I do, without egotism, that I understand the situation south of us as possibly few public men do, I think it my duty to call the attention of the Senate of the United States and of the people of the United States to some of the phases of the conditions existing now in Mexico, and possibly, incidentally, to some of the mistakes already made by this Government in the treatment of affairs in Mexico, and some which will inevitably be made if the present want of policy by this Government is to be continued. To do this intelligently it will be necessary for me to call the attention of the Senate to some facts as well known to other Members of this body as to myself, but possibly not now impressed upon their minds as vividly as upon mine—first, to the condition in Mexico at the time President Wilson was inaugurated on the 4th of March two years ago.

Prior to that time for 35 years Mexico had progressed as few countries in its condition have ever progressed in civilization, development, and education. I know that but recently it has been said by the President that for 30 years more than 80 per cent of the people of Mexico have had nothing to do with their Government, not even a "look in," as I believe he expressed it; nothing to do with the election of their officials or with the administration of their laws. Apparently the President has conceived the idea that the great masses of the Mexican people were left during the thirty odd years of the Diaz administration with no educational advantages, with no attempt to elevate them in the scale of humanity, but that they were simply exploited by foreigners and by residents of Mexico for their own private, individual benefit; that now this great mass of the Mexican people had uprisen and were demanding their rights, and the President himself, sympathizing with this great uprising of the masses in Mexico, has determined that he should allow them to work out, as he expresses it, their own salvation.

Mr. President, a different opinion of Mexico has been held by other prominent officials of the present administration; and I want to call the attention of the Senate to one of the expressions of the Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, to which he gave utterance after his return from Mexico upon his first visit to that country, wherein he says:

Fifth. That President Diaz is entirely deserving of the encomiums bestowed upon him by his own people, by resident Americans, and by visitors. He has a genius for public affairs, understands the conditions and needs of his people, and has their confidence to a degree seldom enjoyed by an executive, either hereditary or elective. While the advantages of a stable government are now so generally recognized that his death or resignation would not disturb the existing order of things, yet his qualifications have been so amply proved and his administration so completely successful that his people are unanimous in the hope that he may yet enjoy many years of official life.

Again, after his second visit Mr. Bryan was called upon, as he said, by citizens all over the United States for information as to Mexico and for advice as to investment in that country by American citizens, capitalists, artisans, railroad men, and bankers. He was asked whether he thought that Mexico was a favorable place for men to go to seek investment or work, and he goes fully into the question, citing examples where Americans have gone there and made money not only by the investment of capital, but as skilled workmen in various lines. The general tenor or trend of all his statement upon the subject constitutes advice to Americans to go into Mexico under the beneficent Diaz administration, invest their capital, and seek work there, and again he speaks in conclusion along that subject of Diaz himself and of the condition of affairs in Mexico:

All things considered, Mexico's experience is illustrative of the growth of Democratic principles and can be studied with profit by Americans. The friendship existing to-day between the United States and Mexico is based upon an identity of interests and upon a growing identity of ideas.

Mr. Bryan speaks of visiting the schools, of seeing the reception by President Diaz of 5,000 school children at Chapultepec from the public schools of the District of Mexico alone. He

speaks of the great stride of education and of the establishment of public schools in practically every district in Mexico.

We are now told that this was the era of the butcher and that the people of Mexico have risen in their might to wrest from those who have so long exploited them the powers of their own government.

Mr. President, I am firm in the belief that the President of the United States is sincere in the statement which he is now making. When this administration came in there had been a revolution in Mexico. The result of it was to overthrow the Madero Government. The final result of it was the assassination of President Madero and of his vice president Suarez. Apparently this administration had been impressed with the idea that the Madero administration represented the desires and the wishes of 80 per cent of the Mexican population, concerning whom the President is constantly referring in interviews and in public speeches.

I shall show later in the course of my remarks something of the truth of the conditions underlying, which the President never grasped and which have never been understood by any officer of this administration so far as I understand it; and without understanding those conditions it is impossible for the President of the United States to deal intelligently with Mexican questions, as he still insists that he shall be allowed to deal with them in some manner.

Huerta was an officer at that time, a general in the Mexican Army. He assisted in the capture of Madero. He has been accused in this country of at least knowing of the plot which resulted in the murder of Madero and Suarez. The President of the United States, in his first message to the Congress of the United States, in which he mentioned Mexican affairs, stated the conditions as he undoubtedly understood them to exist with reference to Huerta's accession to power and what he as the President of this country proposed to do and had done with reference to such conditions in Mexico. All the Members of the Senate, of course, recall the message of the President, but for the purposes of my argument, that I may show the misunderstanding now existing in the mind of the President and of many of the people of the United States with reference to this subject, I am going to call the attention of the Senate to the wording of at least a portion of that message. The President says:

Accordingly, I took the liberty of sending the Hon. John Lind, formerly governor of Minnesota, as my personal spokesman and representative, to the City of Mexico, with the following instructions:

"Press very earnestly upon the attention of those who are now exercising authority or wielding influence in Mexico the following considerations and advice:

"The Government of the United States does not feel at liberty any longer to stand inactive by while it becomes daily more and more evident that no real progress is being made toward the establishment of a government at the city of Mexico which the country will obey and respect."

This message was August 27, 1914:

The Government of the United States does not stand in the same case with the other great Governments of the world in respect of what is happening or what is likely to happen in Mexico. We offer our good offices, not only because of our genuine desire to play the part of a friend, but also because we are expected by the powers of the world to act as Mexico's nearest friend.

A satisfactory settlement seems to us to be conditioned on—

(a) An immediate cessation of fighting throughout Mexico, a definite armistice solemnly entered into and scrupulously observed;

(b) Security given for an early and free election in which all will agree to take part;

(c) The consent of Gen. Huerta to bind himself not to be a candidate for election as President of the Republic at this election; and

(d) The agreement of all parties to abide by the results of the election and cooperate in the most loyal way in organizing and supporting the new administration.

The President then continues:

Mr. Lind executed his delicate and difficult mission with singular tact, firmness, and good judgment, and made clear to the authorities at the City of Mexico not only the purpose of his visit but also the spirit in which it had been undertaken. But the proposals he submitted were rejected in a note the full text of which I take the liberty of laying before you.

Mr. President, the proposals which Mr. Lind submitted to Huerta in Mexico have never been laid before this body or before the Congress of the United States. The tactful proposals of John Lind to Huerta have never been referred to the Senate, nor have they ever been published by the Government of the United States. All we know is what the President has given us here as his instructions to Lind and the answer of Gamboa and Huerta; but Lind's proposals have never been presented to us. We have been compelled, or will be compelled if we want any information as to what the tactful proposals of Mr. Lind were to Mr. Huerta, to search the press of the country. Congress has been left uninformed by the executive department of the Government.

In April of last year there was published in the North American Review a translation from the Mexican of the Lind pro-

posals. I am aware of the fact that the North American Review is not an official publication of the Government. It may not at all times be the mouthpiece of the administration; but at any rate, in the absence of any other information and in view of the high respect which that periodical has had from its readers and from the people generally for so many years, at least as to its honesty and truthfulness, I may be justified in referring to the Lind propositions as they were actually presented by Lind to Huerta and as they were translated and printed in the North American Review under the statement of the editor of that periodical, that this was the correct statement of the Lind proposals. I am not going to quote from them at any length, but we will see by a few extracts from one of them the tactful manner, indorsed by the President, in which Mr. Lind approached Mr. Huerta. This is the translation of the Lind proposal to Huerta:

That unless Huerta voluntarily and on his own initiative—

"Huerta," not President Huerta, not Gen. Huerta, not Mr. Huerta, but "Huerta"—

That unless Huerta, voluntarily and on his own initiative, retires at once from power and abandons every idea of controlling the organization of the government and the conduct of negotiations, the First Magistrate will find himself under the necessity of intervening by means of an ultimatum, and if this is not accepted he will be obliged to propose to the Congress of his country the adoption of practical measures of a most serious nature.

That such a course is absolutely necessary to the end that he (the Chief Executive), by one method or another, to eliminate completely all assistance that Huerta believes he may receive from foreign sources if he persists in his proposal to remain in power, it being a further fact that only for a few days longer will he, Huerta, be free to select the course he chooses to follow.

Under the authority of Col. Harvey, of the North American Review, this is the tactful proposal submitted by the representative of this great Government to the man who at least was recognized as the President of Mexico by every other nation except the United States and Argentina, Brazil, and Chile.

This was to the man to whom ambassadors of France, Great Britain, Germany, and the other great countries of the world were directly accredited. This was to the man who at least had received an autographic letter from the Emperor of one of the greatest empires on the face of the earth, congratulating him or greeting him at least upon his accession to the office of Chief Magistrate of our Republican neighbor, Mexico.

Mr. President, exactly the same tactful methods have been used from the time William Bayard Hale went to Mexico down to the present time in dealing with Huerta, Carranza, or other leaders, except that some of the representatives of this Government have appeared to the people in Mexico at least to be political partners of some of the leaders, if not partners in commercial enterprises.

I have read these extracts from the message of the President of the United States to the Congress, and from what is the best authority which I have been able to reach, the proposal as actually "tactfully" submitted by the representative of the President to Mr. Huerta for the purpose of showing to the Senate that from the very beginning the President of the United States has misunderstood Mexico, and to-day has no conception of the actual conditions existing in that country.

I want to say now, sir, that I acquit the President of the United States of any ulterior motive whatsoever, but I must say that, in my judgment, he has up to the present time been just as unfortunate in the selection of a "tactful" representative as he was in the selection of his first personal representative, Mr. John Lind.

Mr. President, Huerta apparently was a little bit hard to drive out from Mexico. Although Mr. Lind told him that he would have to get out in a few days, he remained some time, until finally an unfortunate occurrence took place at Tampico—unfortunate for him, unfortunate for Mexico, and unfortunate for the United States; unfortunate in the way it was handled for the people of this country—when some subofficer in the Huerta army at Tampico arrested one or two of the marines or sailors of the United States while the flag was said to be flying at the stern of the boat from which they had just landed upon Mexican soil.

Just after this occurrence the President of the United States again came before Congress with a message upon Mexican matters. On April 20 the President asked the Congress of the United States to indorse his action in having sent the naval forces of this Government to Vera Cruz for the purpose distinctly stated in his message, which I will not take the time to read—it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7442, under date April 20, 1914, volume 9—for the exact purpose, as the President states, of wringing from Mr. Huerta the salute demanded by Admiral Mayo to the flag of the United States in apology and reparation for the arrest of these marines and sailors at Tampico. There was no other purpose expressed.

Indignantly denying that there was intended any act of aggression against the Mexican people, that there was any war waged upon the Mexican government, he stated that the difficulty was with one Victoriano Huerta, and this Government would demand such an apology as had been demanded by its admiral at the time of the occurrence of the incident—a salute of so many guns to the flag of the United States and an apology directly given.

Mr. President, was that the purpose for which we landed troops? That was the declared purpose in an official message delivered to this body. Was it the purpose? On May 11, 1914, the bodies of the American sailors and marines who had been killed in this unfortunate attack on Vera Cruz in the effort to make Mr. Huerta fire so many guns as a salute to the flag of the United States were brought back to this soil, and at the Brooklyn Navy Yard the President of the United States pronounced a most eloquent discourse. I want to read what he said there about the service in which the boys died, and show by following that up with other expressions, both in writing and public utterance, that the President seems to have had an idea that there was some other service which was demanded of our sailors and our marines than that which he had expressed as the purpose of the attack upon and the seizing of Vera Cruz in his message to the Congress of the United States. He says:

So, while we are profoundly sorrowful, and while there goes out of our hearts a very deep and affectionate sympathy for the friends and relatives of these lads who for the rest of their lives shall mourn them, though with a touch of pride, we know why we do not go away from this occasion cast down, but with our heads lifted and our eyes on the future of this country, with absolute confidence of how it will be worked out. Not only upon the mere vague future of this country, but upon the immediate future. We have gone down to Mexico to serve mankind, if we can find out the way. We do not want to fight the Mexicans. We want to serve the Mexicans if we can, because we know how we would like to be free and how we would like to be served if there were friends standing by in such case ready to serve us. A war of aggression is not a war in which it is a proud thing to die, but a war of service is a thing in which it is a proud thing to die.

The act of the President of the United States in the seizing of Vera Cruz was pronounced here in the Senate by practically everyone who spoke upon the passage of the resolution of indorsement as if not an act of war, at least, an act of aggression. The President says that—

A war of aggression is not a war in which it is a proud thing to die, but a war of service is a thing in which it is a proud thing to die.

Mr. President, why did not the President of the United States say to the Congress of the United States that he asked our ratification of his act in sending the armed forces of the United States, the sailors and marines of the Navy followed by the Army of the United States, for the purpose of assisting a faction in Mexico in overthrowing Huerta, leader of another faction, and in seizing the capital of that Republic? In his Mobile speech he again referred to this wonderful act of service, and that its results must have convinced the people of the Latin-American countries that the sole desire of the United States was to serve them.

Remember, Mr. President, we ratified by resolution the act of the President of the United States in sending our forces to Vera Cruz to demand of Huerta reparation for an insult to the flag of the United States, nothing more nor less, and yet from that day to this the President has spoken of it as an act of service to some one in Mexico, not even an act of service to the United States of America.

Mr. President, is not this a remarkable condition of affairs? At the time the President of the United States came before Congress and asked us to ratify his act in seizing Vera Cruz, it certainly could not have been his understanding that we were going there for the purpose of serving some other faction in Mexico by driving Huerta from power when that faction had been unable to drive Huerta out themselves, because the President has now said that we should stand aside and leave them to spill all the blood necessary, that we should not interfere in any way whatsoever with the working out of their own salvation between Mexicans themselves; that they were entitled to spill blood; that it was nothing to us; that we had no interest in it.

Therefore, I say it is impossible to conceive the idea that at a time when he sent these marines and sailors down there that he then meant that they were sent there in the service of one or another of the Mexican factions engaged in this same effort to spill blood.

Mr. President, following rapidly along the history of occurrences in Mexico, the next part which stands out in bold relief, showing the dealings of this Government with Mexico, is the effort at mediation. Possibly without the clear impression which these matters left upon my mind, knowing a little of the inside of the operations as I do, you will all recall generally the so-

called efforts at mediation. You will recall the fact that in the first place the President reported that A. B. C.—Argentina, Brazil, and Chile—had offered their services immediately after the Vera Cruz incident in an attempt to bring about an adjustment of the difficulties between this country and Mexico and to prevent war between this country and Mexico. Undoubtedly, soon after the mediators met it must have become apparent to some that the act of aggression at Vera Cruz was an act intended by this Government to be in the service of some faction in Mexico.

In the matter of the discussions, as they were reported from time to time, had before and with the mediators at Niagara, can any Senator recall the question of the salute to the flag demanded by President Wilson? Was there any reference in the various meetings of those mediators to the question of how many guns should be fired? That was the question in dispute between Huerta and President Wilson; that was the purpose for which the mediation was offered, as the press published it; but when the mediators met, with the representatives of this Government and of Huerta present, and various propositions were discussed pro and con between the representatives of the United States and the representatives of Huerta, it then became apparent that mediation was an attempt on the part of the United States Government to adjust the difficulty, and properly so, of course, between the opponents of Huerta in Mexico and Huerta himself, in some way which might possibly result in bringing peace to that distracted country—a most noble purpose, Mr. President—but in consideration of this, the express purpose of our enterprise at Vera Cruz was lost sight of, and no finding, in so far as I know, was ever made upon the subject of the mediation itself, but an abortive attempt was made to bring about some adjustment of affairs between the Huerta faction and the so-called Carranza faction in Mexico.

From day to day discussions were had behind closed doors. Finally the people of the United States were informed by the press, through a signed declaration, as I recall it, of the American representatives, that the proposition under consideration was the attempt by the mediators and by the Carranza representatives to adjust matters to the effect that some man not identified with either the Huerta faction or the so-called Constitutional faction in Mexico should be acting President of Mexico until an election should be held, and the insistence of the American representatives upon the agreement for placing in power a representative of the Carranza faction. I have before me a transcript of the article as it appeared in the papers, signed, or at least officially given out, by our representatives, in which they said that they thought that was best, as the Carranza faction very largely outnumbered the others, and that it would conduce finally to peace, in the event some member of the Carranza faction was recognized as the President of Mexico pending an election and final adjustment of affairs.

Mr. President, I do not know how the dropping of the mediation affected other Members of the Congress of the United States; I do not know what impression remained on the mind of the President of the United States after the cessation of attempts at mediation; but I do know what effect it left upon the minds of the people of Mexico. The general discussion was along the line, and the general understanding arrived at was along the line, that Huerta should get out; should surrender the City of Mexico; that the Constitutionalists should be allowed to go into the city; that Carranza himself should give certain pledges to the United States that he would not persecute or murder—that is what it meant—those who had not adhered to him, but who had fought him; that he should grant general amnesty for the time being at least; and that some man not obnoxious to either faction should take temporarily the reins of power until an election could be had. That was the general understanding of the people of Latin America, as well as of Mexicans, as to what had been generally arrived at, while no man had been selected or named by agreement between the parties.

What took place? Huerta retired from the City of Mexico, placing in power Carbajal, who had not been obnoxious to Carranza nor to any other faction in Mexico so far as was known, whose name had been discussed before the mediators, who had not been agreed upon, but who was generally regarded as the one man in Mexico who possibly would be accepted by both sides.

Huerta turned over the City of Mexico to Carbajal, withdrew, and, sailing for Europe, left the country as it was understood in Mexico and in Latin America, pursuant to the understanding of the mediators and our representatives at Niagara. Carbajal requested the United States to say to Mr. Carranza: "You must not go into the City of Mexico until you have made the pledges which were mentioned by your representatives and by ours; that is, to the effect that you will not persecute, prosecute, nor kill those who did not agree with you; that you will grant general amnesty until such time as a President can be elected and

a government which would be recognized by the United States could be formed in Mexico."

Was that understanding of the Mexicans and of the Latin Americans well founded or not? Having driven Huerta out without demanding, but simply requesting, of Carranza some assurance, without demanding of him security that the general, tentative understanding of the Mexican people, founded upon the understanding with the mediators or before the mediators—without demanding security that this general understanding should be carried out, although we did, so far as the press publications disclosed, request of Mr. Carranza certain assurances; without securing those assurances we allowed Carbajal to turn over the City of Mexico to Carranza, in absolute violation, as a great majority of the Mexican people believe to-day, of the pledges which we at least gave at Niagara. You will not find an intelligent man knowing anything of Mexican affairs—I mean an intelligent Mexican—who will not tell you to-day that he understood, and that the Mexican people and the Latin-American people understood, that we had given a pledge that if Huerta got out of the country Carranza should not be allowed to go into the City of Mexico until he had pledged himself and given ample security to us for his good conduct. They believe that we were false; they believe that we misled them; they believe that we had some ulterior purpose or that we at least were so weak that we allowed a horde of bandits and murderers to go into the capital city of Mexico when we had it in our power to keep them out. They believe that Huerta could have kept them out, and that he would have been there to-day in possession of the City of Mexico had it not been for the service rendered to Carranza by the landing of our troops and our marines and the seizing of Vera Cruz.

When we mix in international affairs, when we invite mediation, then, before closing the chapter, we should at least understand what the other parties to the controversy resulting in mediation understood as its result. Of course it was generally known that no definite result had been arrived at in so far as naming a particular man for temporary President who should be recognized and upheld by the United States; that they could not do; but it was felt by the Mexicans that when Carbajal, whose name was discussed and who was not objectionable, was placed in charge and Huerta got away at the demand of this Government, that the Huerta faction had carried out the general understanding in good faith, and neither the Mexicans nor other Latin Americans believe that we ever did carry it out in good faith. So we have not risen very highly in the estimation of the people of Mexico.

Mr. President, I am not going to take up time to read the statement of the American delegates to that mediation conference; I am not going to take time even to call attention or to read into the RECORD the protocol of agreement between the representatives of this Government and the representatives of Huerta as to what matters should be discussed. Those are matters which have become public in so far as the press of the United States has been able to make them public, but not in so far as we have any official information from the administrative department of this Government upon them.

When Carranza entered the City of Mexico in the face of protests from foreign representatives and our own representatives, he proceeded to punish without hesitation, by shooting to death I am afraid to undertake to say how many of the more prominent citizens of that Republic who remained within the city or whom he could seize in whatever quarter under his control without trial. Mr. President, the so-called court-martial proceedings of either faction in Mexico consists in one man sitting in his office or at his desk or in his chair or leaning up against a wall and ordering a file of soldiers to go and arrest another man and shoot him. Those are the trials that are had; those are the trials that were held by the Carranza courts in the city of Mexico. Man after man, delegates of the Republic, senators, members of the standing committee on legislation, were shot down—assassinated. The police force was discharged; the courts were closed; the streets were paraded by soldiers, so called, of the Carranza army; business houses were closed and the seal of foreign embassies placed upon them for their protection; and armed bands of rioters paraded the streets of the City of Mexico. That was the so-called Carranza government.

Do you wonder now, Mr. President, that the people of Mexico, in whose behalf we are supposed to be acting, can not understand or appreciate the great services which we have rendered them so far, when we have simply driven out one man who did represent something of law and order, under whom the courts were open, under whom civil process was secure, and have driven out the constituted police force and the constituted authorities, thrown open the doors of the jails, and turned loose on the community a horde of murderers and thieves? Do you

suppose that they can understand what we mean when we say that we are acting in their service?

Mr. President, I hasten along. After occupying Vera Cruz we were anxious apparently to know what the different leaders of Mexico, aside from the Huerta faction, would think of our action. We heard through the press that Mr. Carranza repudiated such action upon our part and that he was very severe in his criticism of our action, but that he said whenever he got in power he would salute the flag, and we could get off Mexican soil. We understood from the press at the same time that Mr. Villa was the friend of the United States, and that Mr. Villa thought that we were correct, or, at least, he did not resent our taking Vera Cruz. So at once those of us who wanted to think that the action of the United States was proper under the circumstances imagined that Mr. Villa was our friend and that Carranza was our enemy. As a matter of fact, reports came here from official sources to that effect; reports from American representatives, who are attached to Villa's court, came here to that effect, and the attempt was made to make this Government and the people of the country understand that Villa was a true friend of the American people.

Mr. President, the 16th of September is in Mexico their independence day, the anniversary of the day on which Hidalgo raised the cry of freedom. It is celebrated there every year all over the entire Republic as our Fourth of July is celebrated here. It is celebrated in various ways, as we celebrate the Fourth of July, celebrated by public speech, as we celebrate our Fourth of July here. On the 16th of September in Torreon, in the presence of the victorious army of Gen. Villa, speeches were made and references were made to the occupation by the Americans of Vera Cruz and to the fact that Vera Cruz was still in the hands of the foreigners. The Zaragoza brigade is one of the brigades which is even yet faithful to Gen. Villa, which has remained faithful to him, despite the fact that within the last month Benavides and others have deserted him, despite the fact that Gen. Monclovia Herrera, who was in command of the army to which the Zaragoza brigade belonged, has now taken up arms against Villa. At that time they were all together, Monclovia Herrera was one of Villa's own soldiers, and the Zaragoza brigade was his own brigade, and is as yet faithful to him. On that day Col. Manuel C. Izaguirre, of the Zaragoza brigade, one of their leaders, made a speech, which was considered to be so representative of the sentiment of Villa's army, that under threat, as the Parral paper says, of Monclovia Herrera himself they published the speech. I am going to read two or three extracts from it, which constitute a literally correct translation of the remarks of Col. Izaguirre, of the Zaragoza brigade of Villa's army.

It is time that we should drive from our soil the usurper Army of the north or that Divine anger should humble and destroy us, as death is a thousand times more preferable to consenting to its remaining in our first maritime seaport, where solely is allowed the permanency of the noble sons of Cuahutemoc, or those of eagle sight, those of brown skin and dark eyes, the sons of Hidalgo, Morelos, and of Juarez. * * *

It is now time that men of the Indian figure of Guerrero, of Melchor Ocampo, or of Ignacio Zaragoza should appear and no longer tolerate such ignominy.

Let us forego this dreadful indifference and fling ourselves upon the American colossus and dispute that piece of our ground, cradle of the greatest men of our national history.

We here find ourselves in the sanctuary of the fatherland, where we have come to honor the memory of that Pleiades of heroes. Let us honor the same in a manner worthy of them. Let us honor it by starting a bloody struggle, protesting with all energy against the ineffaceable insult—

That is a very liberal translation, but it is the best I can do—suffered by our national integrity in the conception that Gens. Maclovio and Luis Herrera have called the attention of the present provisional president of the Republic to the urgent necessity that in the shortest possible time the seaport of Vera Cruz be evacuated by the American forces, and they have been given a certain time in which to effect same, which terminates on the 30th instant, and within that period if the same is not carried out then it will be our inevitable duty to take up arms in order to drive them from our territory, and we are sure there will not be a Mexican who does not join us and who will remain impassive to the armed movement which is to take place on the 30th of the present month in the event that the colossus of the north still insists upon profaning our national sovereignty.

Comrades, long live Mexico! Death to the puritan Wilson! Death to the Americans!

On the 14th of November Vera Cruz was evacuated, but we have not heard from official sources, Mr. President, why Vera Cruz was evacuated. We have no knowledge that the Mexican Government or Huerta or his successor has ever acceded, or did ever accede, to the demands of the United States, served upon him at the muzzle of the artillery and the guns of the marines and the sailors at Vera Cruz. We have received no information. Even in the President's message to Congress we had nothing at all upon the subject of Mexico. We know nothing as to what has taken place. We have been compelled to appeal to the columns of the press, and some of us, who are

able to do so, to entirely other sources for the information which we have upon the subject.

Mr. President, the next occurrence to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate concerning Mexican affairs and our participation therein, is that, as was foretold more than once and as I have myself stated to the Senate upon more than one occasion, immediately upon the acquisition of power by Carranza, the forces which had been supporting him to drive Huerta out turned their guns against Carranza; and after this Government had succeeded in driving Huerta out of the City of Mexico there were seven revolutions in a week. This is true, although Carranza was supposed to be the representative of the Madero movement, and the Madero movement was supposed to represent, and is supposed, apparently, in the mind of the President of the United States, to represent the demands of 80 per cent of the population, with which, he says, he is so heartily in sympathy.

Mr. President, 160 of the generals who had been declaring their allegiance to Carranza until we drove Huerta out met in convention at the City of Mexico. Subsequently they retired for consideration, as they said, to get away from the presidential influence and for more mature deliberation and consideration, to the city of Aguas Calientes. Under the agreement made at Torreon, to which I have previously referred in a speech in the Senate, it was understood that Mr. Carranza signed a written agreement with Villa to the effect that, so soon as they occupied Mexico City, a convention of the generals should be held and a temporary president elected, who should remain in power and be supported by the armed forces of Mexico until an election could be held.

So an attempt was made to carry out this agreement, and this convention was called, first, in the City of Mexico, and then, upon the statement of several of its members that possibly they would be subject to the influence of Carranza, who was then in power, they retired to Aguas Calientes, by a resolution adopted, for the further consideration of the agreement of Torreon. There they elected Antonio I. Villarreal as president of that convention, and they proceeded to discuss the question of the election of a temporary president. Villa appeared before the convention, through his representatives and in person and by his army, 20 miles away, and demanded that Carranza be altogether eliminated from affairs in Mexico, offering at the same time to refuse the presidency, even if it were offered him, and pledging himself not to become a candidate for any office.

Carranza at once replied to the convention, saying that if Villa would surrender his military command and get out of Mexico he, Carranza, would surrender his civil and military command, renounce all pretensions to the presidency, and expatriate himself forever from his country. Neither got out. This man Villarreal, who was the president of the convention and one of the delegates who waited upon Carranza demanding Carranza's resignation, took part in the selection of Gutierrez as the successor of Carranza, then ostensibly going to the City of Mexico to insist upon the resignation of Carranza in accordance with the demands of the convention. He proceeded to the State of Coahuila and took charge of his army.

I shall call attention in a short time to this gentleman, Mr. Villarreal, as a representative of the spirit in Mexico which President Wilson has never understood, and who still is one of the most prominent, one of the most intelligent men among the leaders of that Republic. He has written more and said more than any of the present leaders, and it is remarkable to me that the President of the United States does not know something of the views held by the followers of Antonio I. Villarreal.

Gutierrez was declared President by this convention of generals; and in their usual dramatic manner, not satisfied with passing resolutions such as we would pass here, a very large Mexican flag was brought into the convention hall and those generals sat down at their desks and inscribed their names upon the flag, swearing to support the action of the convention to the last drop of their life's blood. That flag is now a fugitive on this side of the border, brought over by 5 of the 13 who were appointed especially to guard it "forever."

Following the appointment of Gutierrez, and preceding his arrival in the city, Mr. Carranza evacuated Mexico, Gen. Obregon, who is now in charge of Mexico City, first declaring himself independent as the President of Mexico, but later concluding that he had better retire and follow Carranza into Vera Cruz. Gutierrez remained outside the city limits to allow his military forces to reconnoiter following the evacuation of the army of Obregon, and by mutual agreement the Zapata forces came in from one side and Villa and Zapata rode down the streets of Mexico City together, the great conquering heroes, one of them the bandit of the north and the other the bandit of the south. Gutierrez followed and was proclaimed the President of Mexico,

Carranza then being at Vera Cruz. Mr. Gutierrez, the choice of this convention of the generals, of all the leaders of the Constitutionalist forces in Mexico, was introduced to the convention in a speech advocating his nomination, and the only one which was made, and which was indorsed by the official publication of the convention proceedings thereafter. He was indorsed for the Presidency of Mexico because of the fact that he had burned more bridges in the last four years than any other man in the Republic of Mexico. Unfortunately for Gutierrez, he did not take his bridge burners along with him into the City of Mexico as a personal guard; but that was furnished, with a great deal of forethought, by Hon. Francisco Villa, so that when some of the occurrences took place of which Mr. Gutierrez has spoken officially, and which have not been published in this country, Mr. Gutierrez said that he was unable to interfere. Some of these matters I shall refer to a little later.

Villa and Zapata retired, leaving their respective followers in sufficient number, as they supposed, to guard Mr. Gutierrez and to protect Mexico City—the one to the north, the other to the south—and Mr. Gutierrez seized the first opportunity of which he could avail himself and escaped from the clutches of both, setting up another independent revolution.

Zapata then declared that he would have nothing more to do with the election of a President, but that he himself was the supreme chief of the south, independent of Villa or anyone else. Villa hurried back into the City of Mexico and proclaimed Mr. Roque Gonzales Garcia as the President of the Republic. Obregon coming in on his lone hand, after driving Zapata out of Puebla and gaining the outskirts of the City of Mexico, the Villa forces evacuated the city, leaving poor Roque Gonzales Garcia to this day unheard of, and cutting Villa off from the entrance from the north to the city. Villa at once seeing the great need of some government, Carranza at Vera Cruz, Gutierrez at San Luis Potosi, Zapata in Morelos, and the various other leaders at different places seeing the great need of law and order in a country over which he was supreme, each declared himself the President of Mexico, so that to-day, in so far as anyone knows, we have Carranza the President at Vera Cruz, we have Gutierrez the President somewhere unknown, we have Roque Gonzales Garcia's whereabouts entirely unknown, and we have Zapata, the supreme chief of the south, reported as holding the waterworks of the City of Mexico, and Mr. Pancho Villa in the north, the friend of the United States, also the President of Mexico. This is about the political condition as we understand it, each fighting the other, and every general of each claimed by each if he happens to capture a town. Benevides and other gentlemen who have been with Villa are now either with Gutierrez or directly with Carranza or with Obregon. None of these leaders can tell from day to day where one of his generals is, and each treats every town that he enters as the enemy's country for the purpose of loot and of theft.

Mr. President, what is the great service that this country has performed for Mexico?

Take Carranza, for instance, who is the constitutionalist chief, with representatives even in Washington. When Carranza's army evacuated the City of Mexico they took with them great trainloads of household furniture. They had taken nothing when they arrived in the City of Mexico. They robbed houses, they took pianos, sewing machines, desks, furniture of all kinds out of the houses of the people whom they had driven out of the City of Mexico and carried them to Vera Cruz.

I mention this simply as an example of what is done by each of the leaders whenever he is driven out of a town.

We have heard a great deal in the American press of Gen. Benjamin Hill, spelled H-I-L-L, who has been so boldly and courageously entrenched at Naco, until finally our diplomatic chief of staff persuaded him to get out and withdraw from the border. Do not make the mistake of thinking that Gen. Hill is an American. His name is Gil, pronounced "Hill" in Spanish, and consequently we become accustomed to spelling it H-I-L-L. A short time ago I was down around Naco when balls were not whizzing in my direction, because I took care of that, but still were coming across the line. Gen. Hill was in his headquarters. He had just arrived, and was in his headquarters in a little adobe house in the Mexican part of the town. He had just come out of Cananea, and he had brought his furniture along with him. His wife was sitting at the door of the house, and an automobile full of Americans passed through, going down to Cananea. One of the ladies in the machine, being acquainted with Mrs. Hill, stopped to speak to her. The old lady is very amiable, and pointed out to the American lady that she had quite a lot of household goods. This is the wife of the general in command of the Carranza force, sitting there puffing his cigarette. She said she had quite a lot of household goods, and she was ready to dispose of some of them. The articles to which

this American lady's attention was particularly called were three pianos, three grafonolas or talking machines of some kind, and seven sewing machines. Mrs. Hill was offering the sewing machines at \$5 apiece. Upon one of the ladies saying, "Why, they are quite cheap," she responded, "Oh, yes; but you know they didn't cost us anything"; and they did not. They had been brought from the houses of citizens of Cananea. One of the commanding generals, when he went through to El Paso, being called to the city of Mexico by Mr. Carranza, bought \$100,000 worth of diamonds from diamond merchants there with money not altogether derived from the proceeds of the sale of sewing machines.

Mr. President, bankruptcy has overtaken Mexico, of course; but I do not know whether any of you have thought of the method by which these different leaders were undertaking to finance themselves. You have talked of "high finance" here in this country. Mr. Bryan has said, in one of the extracts I have read to you, that we in the United States might well take the example of Mexico in various matters of government, study it with great interest and profit to ourselves, and follow it. I may say, Mr. President, that we might possibly have thought that we knew something about finance. Mr. Obregon, in the City of Mexico, when he entered there a few days ago, declared that the money which had been recognized by Villa and Zapata as a circulating medium could not be received; but this was after he had himself used a certain amount of that money—about \$300,000—whereupon he declared that it would not be received further. Villa issues his own currency and signs it himself, and if you do not take it you are shot. You take it at the price he puts on it, and you can not pay your laborers in your mines or on your farms or on your cattle ranch with American or Mexican gold. You must take your gold to Villa, and you must buy from him certificates, signed by himself, at a certain given price—35 cents on the dollar. They are quoted on the market to-day at 9½ cents, but you can not buy them from a broker; you can not buy them outside. You are not allowed to start a new enterprise, to open your mine, on the money of Mr. Villa himself unless you buy it from him. The consequence is that when it is once out in circulation there is no earthly chance for a new enterprise to start up except by getting some more of it in circulation from Mr. Villa himself.

Why, to illustrate the remarkable esteem in which this manner of financing is held, I have a friend from Cleveland, Ohio, who is very largely interested in the mining business; and, while he has not been able to conduct his mines for some time, he has at one of his mining camps some four or five hundred tons or more of copper left over which he has not been able to ship out of the country. The State treasurer of the State of Chihuahua informed this friend on a recent visit to Mexico that they needed a ton of copper, and they were going to send up to his mine to get it. The American said, "How are you going to pay for it?" "Why," he said, "in our money." "At what price?" "Why, at 35 cents. We are giving it out at 35 cents." "Oh," he said, "you don't get that copper at any such price as that. I have no copper to sell you, and I do not choose to sell you any." Then he added: "Perhaps, though, as a matter of friendship, we can make a trade. I will tell you what I will do; I will trade with you." Vargas asked, "How?" He said, "This Villa money?" "Yes." "Well, just ten for ten."

It seems ridiculous, Senators, that a so-called revolution can be financed in any such way; but when you understand that every man, every soldier in each one of these commands, getting hold of a piece of this signed money, from whomever it is issued—Carranza, Obregon, Maytorena, Hill, Villa, Zapata, every other leader issuing his own money—going into a town, notifies everyone there who has anything to sell or anything that he wants: "We propose to pay you for it, but you must take our money, and if you do not take it you are shot." This is the method by which they are financing their revolutions when they make any pretense whatsoever of returning any value for that which they seize without compunction.

I do not think the President of the United States can understand the conditions exactly as they exist there, otherwise he would not utter the sentiments upon which he seems to base his action toward Mexico.

I have in my pocket a list of the shipments of cattle, hides, and meat from the various points along the Mexican border to the United States for the two months last past. I have already taken up a great deal more of the time of the Senate than I had expected to use, and I do not care to occupy more time by reading statistics into the RECORD, but I am going to refer to the method by which this meat is acquired and who is shipping it.

One of the great packing houses in this country has a representative in Juarez. Pancho Villa owns a packing house there. He has seized it and taken charge of it. He issued a decree

prohibiting the exportation of cattle from Chihuahua, even with the duties which are placed upon them paid into his hands. He has had some trouble because the stolen cattle were seized on this side and identified by their brands. Finding that he had trouble in getting the cattle over and getting the money out of them, he established this packing house, with, as is reported, an American representative of one of the great packing establishments of this country in partnership with him, and there they are killing stolen beef, known to every man in the State of Chihuahua to be stolen, taken from Americans and Mexicans alike wherever they can be seized; they are killed and are shipped across into this country as far as Kansas City. The hides are not even packed so that they can be identified and seized. There is no way of identifying a hide or animal as the property of anyone, run as they are on our ranges, except by the brands; and the Government of the United States will not revise its laws with reference to manifests, although the collector of the port of El Paso has requested it to do so, so as to compel them to state what certain branded hides are in the bales of 500 pounds which are sent over here.

The consequence is that \$350,000 worth of stolen hides have been imported or brought over into this country through the Juarez customhouse within the last six months.

These things are going on all the time. You have heard here before of the millions of dollars' worth of cotton belonging to the Spanish and the French citizens that were seized at Torreon. Possibly you may not have heard this, but it is an open scandal in Mexico that certain parties claiming to represent this Government in some capacity or other—I do not mean here, of course, but I mean certain local representatives of the Government down there—are said to have made \$200,000 out of this sale of French and Spanish cotton. As I said here at one time, in the eyes of the people of Spain and France and other countries who are interested, we are acting as an international "fence" in protecting these bandits and robbers and burglars who are stealing property in Mexico and shipping it over here with impunity, and we are enforcing our laws so as to protect them, instead of assisting the owners in even tracing their property, so that eventually they may make demands for repayment if there ever is a government established in Mexico.

Mr. President, the President of the United States said in one of his speeches that the people of South America and Latin America had heretofore suffered under a system, which he said they were compelled to adopt, of concessions. He said in an interview—apparently an authorized interview in May of last year in the Saturday Evening Post, with Samuel G. Blythe—that we proposed to help the Mexican people, and that finally he, the President of the United States, proposed to see that they were not exploited by outsiders. He spoke of concessions, and said that the first thing to get rid of in Latin American countries and in Mexico is the "concession" system, under which they have been compelled, as he says, to develop their resources and to obtain money; and yet, if he would inquire of the representative of the State Department who is with Villa always, in more ways than one, he would know that there never has been in the history of Mexico such bald-faced thievery and grafting as has been carried on by the pets of Mr. Villa, some of them foreigners, under the system of concessions. Never in the history of Mexico nor the history of any similar civilized country has anything like it been known. The birds of prey are gathered along the borders, and they have their representatives at the throne of Villa and other leaders in Mexico.

The President seems to think that these people are actually fighting for something. They are; but he does not know that the great struggle to-day in Mexico is between the factions over the Tampico oil fields. He does not know that every move Villa makes in attempting to drive his foes out of his way in the north is toward Tampico, and that it is not for the purpose of securing arms and ammunition. They are allowed to go to him across our borders. He needs no seaport. It is for the purpose of seizing and confiscating the oil wells in that district, which is the greatest oil district on this continent by five to one to-day. Efforts have been made already by agents of Villa in this country to finance him when he seizes those oil fields. I am informed that efforts have been made or are being made by representatives of Carranza, upon the other hand, to do the same thing. Whose property is it? It makes no difference. One method or another of confiscation is used.

When we say "confiscation," or when we read in the papers that a certain piece of property has been confiscated or will be confiscated, we naturally think that means by a decree of some authorized or duly constituted body, followed up by the party whose property is taken having his day in court, as we enforce decrees of confiscation; that there is some legal proceeding taken. What they understand in Mexico by a decree of con-

fiscation is confiscation such as is perpetrated by the train robber upon the express messenger with a six-shooter at his head. No legal forms have ever been invoked or carried out or proceeded under in any decree of confiscation in Mexico. These people have gone to the extreme to which Juarez went in 1860 when he was fighting a foreign enemy. They have invoked the decree which Juarez issued against those who assisted Maximilian, a foreign enemy undertaking to subvert their Government and turn it into a monarchy. He did go to extremes, Mr. President, and he treated as traitors those who joined Maximilian. Each one of these people in his own little command, in his own little town, invokes the Juarez decree No. 62 against every opponent whom he may meet in that town, and may shoot him down like a dog.

Mr. President, three years ago American citizens were shot down on the border in the fights between Mexican factions on the other side, first at Agua Prieta and later at El Paso. Speeches were made here in the United States Senate about it. The country began to wake up to the fact that American citizens were being shot down in the American cities, and the great parties held conventions, and declarations were put in the platform at least of the Democratic Party brought about by that very condition, as I was told by some of those who assisted in making that platform. They told me that because the Republican administration had not taken strong measures to stop the killing of American citizens on this side of the border the Democratic Party had gone on record as promising that it would stop it, and that citizens on our borders should be protected in their lives and in their property. Has that been done? No. Neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party has made a move to stop the killing of Americans on this side, except that the Chief of Staff of this country was finally sent down to the border after 49 Americans, many of them soldiers, had been shot down on this side, killed and wounded; after the public schools of the little American town of Naco had been closed for two months or more, and the children were not allowed by their parents out on the streets for fear of being killed, while the American people in that little town were living in cellars and barricading the windows in their houses and were still being shot down in their hotels and when they appeared on the streets. Finally our military authorities seized the town of Naco, and would not allow you to depart from a train or to take a train either in or out of Naco for fear that you would be shot; and the trains stopping on their way from California at the station of Naco were shot into and people wounded around the railroad station; but our troops were not allowed to prevent it, and finally were withdrawn behind the hills a mile away where they would not be hurt themselves. Then, after all these things, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army was sent down there in order that he might get together with two bandits and undertake to persuade them to go away from the border and not to hurt our American citizens. Of course they were persuaded; and yesterday they marched back, and yet the President of the United States seems to think that it is possible to place confidence in the word of one of these men!

Mr. President, I do not want to arouse any passion. I am simply attempting to make a plain statement of facts. I am not appealing to any prejudice or any passion of the Senate. I do not want the impression to go out to the country that I am attempting to make any such appeal, because I have been very carefully attempting to restrain myself from any expression of my indignation or my feeling in this matter. I am making these remarks simply to let you know what is going on and how the President is mistaken in order that in dealing with this bill you may understand that conditions may arise and will inevitably arise out of the Mexican affairs where you are going to need some money and some men before the United States gets through there.

Now, Mr. President, I shall not read, as I could, the affidavits showing the most horrible state of affairs in Mexico that ever existed in any country of which I have ever read, except in Santo Domingo after the uprising of the negroes.

It is necessary to call the attention of Senators, however, to the fact that in the Republic of Mexico there were sisters of charity, women engaged in undertaking to spread education among the poor people, women engaged in charitable work in the hospitals and sanitariums, and there is not one of them left to-day to carry on the work, but hundreds of them have suffered the most horrible outrages at the hands of these so-called Constitutionalists. There is not one solely to blame, but all are equally guilty. There has just been driven out of Guadalajara in the last day or two one of the men who drove women along in front of him, kindly, gentle, charitable, educated women. He drove them along, herding them for the use of his

army when he evacuated Guadalajara. I have said that every town was the enemy's country. In going through the country the poor, common, ordinary Mexicans, who had nothing to do with the revolution, who were not interested in it, who were friendly, and who met them in a friendly way when they came through, have been maltreated and shot down without provocation or excuse by so-called "Constitutionalists," "Villistas," and others, their homes burned, their property seized, and their women outraged. It makes no difference who they are, every piece of loot that can be obtained is considered legitimate loot, and every town that is captured is the enemy's country for the purpose of loot and worse than loot.

What can happen with conditions such as these existing? What must happen inevitably? Will the world stand by and see a reversion to barbarism of 13,000,000 people simply because a few worthless bandits have obtained arms and have worked upon their credulity, with the statement made by Villa and others that all the property is going to be turned over and divided up?

At the outside, 200,000 people have been interested in this revolution. There are 13,000,000 Mexican people appealing to the Christian people of the United States and of the world. Religion itself is calling upon the civilized nations of the earth to uphold that banner which was carried among those poor Indians 350 years ago.

Why, sir, if the State Department of this Government would publish its reports, would publish statements as to why Huerta left Mexico, and a list of the outrages committed by Villa, the killing of men, women, and children, the assassination of members of Congress, of members of the Senate, the assassination of everyone whom he could catch who disagreed with him, names and lists given by the then President, Guitierrez, if not by Villa himself—if these lists could be published, and if the people of the United States could see the affidavits which have been made by the women of the religious orders in Mexico and the statements, which there has been no attempt made to controvert, showing the absolute breaking down of civilization, the President of the United States would no longer remain in ignorance and in control of the sentiment of the people of the United States.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate for a moment to the official utterance of the Liberal Party of Mexico, of whom Antonio Villarreal, the president of the Mexican convention, is the great leader. He was one of the original revolutionary junta that issued the first manifesto of July 1, 1906.

One reason, I may say in passing, why I have been rather familiar with the occurrences in Mexico is because I was present at the Cananea riot, when the original private papers of the original revolutionary junta were seized in 1906, and I was instrumental to some extent in seeing that those private papers went to the proper authorities in Mexico, where they would be of some use.

Antonio Villarreal was one of the original revolutionary junta. This "junta" issued various proclamations to the people of Mexico. They have issued one proclamation to certain people throughout the world referring to Mexico. This was in 1911. These are the ideas entertained by Villarreal and his class of people in Mexico, in so far as any of them are sincere about anything.

I deny that you can find a Mexican patriot to-day in the Republic of Mexico. If there is a man who has ever had any patriotism in his body in Mexico, he is a fugitive in the United States or in some other country to-day.

This is a call to the workers of the world, made by Villarreal, Magon, Sarabia, Rivera, and others, in 1911, when the Madero revolution was going on, showing what their ideas were and what they were calling upon their people to do:

The Mexican Liberal Party is not fighting to destroy the dictator, Porfirio Diaz, in order to put in his place a new tyrant. The Mexican Liberal Party is taking part in the actual insurrection with the deliberate and firm purpose of expropriating the land and the means of production and handing them over to the people; that is, to each and every one of the inhabitants of Mexico, without distinction of sex. This act we consider essential to open the gates for the effective emancipation of the Mexican people.

There is also another party in arms, the Antireelectionist Party, whose leader, Francisco I. Madero, is a millionaire, who has seen his fabulous fortune grow with the sweat and the tears of the peons of his haciendas. This party is fighting to make "effective" the right to vote, and to found, in short, a bourgeois Republic like that of the United States. This purely political and capitalist party is naturally an enemy of the Mexican Liberal Party, because it sees in the activity of the liberals a menace to the survival of the bourgeois Republic which guarantees to politicians, to seekers for jobs, to the rich, to all the ambitious, to those who would like to live at the cost of the suffering and the slavery of the proletariat, the continuance of social inequality, the capitalist system, the division of the human family into two classes—that of the exploiters and that of the exploited.

The dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz is about to fall; but the revolution will not end by this act alone. Upon the tomb of this infamous

dictatorship there will stand face to face, with arms in the hand, two social classes, that of the well fed and that of the hungry, the first upholding the interests of its caste and the second the abolition of those privileges by means of the installation of a system which guarantees to every human being bread, land, and liberty.

This formidable fight of the two social classes in Mexico is the first act of the great universal tragedy which will soon have for its stage the surface of the whole planet, and whose final act will be the triumph of the noble formula, liberty, equality, and fraternity, that the political revolutions of the bourgeoisie have not been able to crystallize into fact because they have not dared to break the backbone of tyranny, capitalism, and authority.

Comrades of all the world, the solution of the social problem is in the hands of all disinherited of the whole earth, for they only require the practice of one great virtue—solidarity. Your brothers in Mexico have had the courage to raise on high the red flag, but not to make a puerile boast with it in inoffensive manifestations through streets and plazas, which almost always terminate with the arrest and the wounding of the participants by the cossacks of the tyrant, but to sustain it firmly in the battle fields as a spirited challenge to the old society which it is trying to crush in order to build on the solid earth the new society of justice and of love.

Our forces, however generous and self-sacrificing they may be, may be annihilated by the solid action of the bourgeoisie of all the countries of the world. By the simple act of having brought about the appearance of the red flag in the Mexican battle field the bourgeoisie of the United States has obliged President Taft to send 20,000 soldiers to the Mexican border and warships to the Mexican ports. What are the workers of the world doing in the meantime? Crossing their arms and viewing as from the seats of a theater the persons and the events of this tremendous drama, which ought to move every heart, which ought to arouse every conscience, which ought to make the nerves of all the dispossessed of the world vibrate intensely and to make them rise as one man to hold back the fleets and to halt the uniformed slaves of every country.

Mr. President, magnificent language! This man was one of the best writers and best speakers I ever heard or read, as keen and shrewd a labor agitator as ever lived. These are his public utterances.

Following along, there have been circulated letters which, as I said, were seized as early as 1906, proclamations issued to the Yaqui Indians, the Zapotecs, the Mayas, and other Indians all over Mexico, to this effect:

Before the Spaniards came into the country the mines in which you are now working were yours. They are yours now. Take them.

Before the Spaniards came into the country the lands were yours. They are yours now. Take them.

The cattle upon those lands take as interest upon your investment. The improvements upon the farms are yours, because the lands were yours and these people have exploited you. This country is yours. You need no government. Government has been against you.

Just as he says here in his public utterance, but he is too shrewd to publish as boldly as he speaks to those poor ignorant people down there.

When we have elevated Madero the revolution will keep on and these two great opposing forces will be face to face, and you will stand in the struggle for the ultimate end.

Now, how does that appeal to these poor, ignorant people down there, 80 to 90 per cent of whom can not read or write, who still have a race prejudice against the white man, whether the blood of the Spaniard or the blood of the Anglo-Saxon flows in his veins, who feel that prejudice against the conqueror which the Aztecs felt against Cortez in the time of Montezuma? They are a quiet, peaceable people, the great majority of them, millions of them wanting to continue to work in the mines in Mexico. At Cananea, which was the center originally of the rebellion, they insisted upon remaining at work and not joining either army. There are millions of these people who, when they hear these eloquent speakers say what they are going to do, exclaim, "May God speed your army; go ahead!" and they do not fight against it. They have no arms, no ammunition, nothing with which to act; but they are waiting and praying and begging for some power to come to their assistance.

We have the same people in New Mexico whom I know so well, the Zunis, Hopis, and Indians of like character, generally spoken of as Pueblos, and never but once in all history on this continent were they found with arms in their hands. They are a quiet, peaceful, good people. There are millions and millions of them in Mexico of exactly the same character. They have no earthly interest in this revolution, except that they are being exploited and shot, their sons murdered, and their daughters outraged by every band that happens to come through one of their little settlements.

These demagogues with no desire in the world except to raise themselves to some position where they can live from the efforts of these poor people, these men who simply have not been grafters in the past because they had no opportunity to graft, now desire to foist themselves upon the people. To these demagogues the President of the United States has given ear, of course unwittingly and unknowingly, not understanding the true condition of affairs in Mexico.

Mr. President, I shall refer to only one other matter, which must have opened the eyes of the President of the United States. Everyone understands that Mr. Villa has been supposed by some of the representatives of this Government to be the most promi-

nent man in Mexico and the one possibly through whom a settlement of Mexican affairs might be worked out without the interference of this Government.

Now, sir, in view of that feeling and of the fact that publication has not yet been made of Villa's true character, I am going to give to the Senate a statement of the character of man he is, as shown by one of his acts recently in the City of Mexico, and I do it, sir, with only the desire to impress on the mind of the Senators of the United States the character of this man from whom apparently the administration yet hopes something.

I have denounced him before as a bandit without conscience, as a bloody murderer for hire, and I have known of him personally for years. Mr. President, when Mr. Villa went into the City of Mexico at the time Gutierrez went in as President he visited a hotel in that city known as the Hotel Palacio. The proprietor of the hotel is a French reservist who had joined his colors and who is now fighting for his country in France. Before leaving the City of Mexico this Frenchman made a schedule of his property, placed it in the hands of the French Embassy, and also placed his property under the care of the French Embassy. He left his wife, a young French woman, in charge of the hotel. I am not going into all of the details, Mr. President. I do not want, as I said, to arouse passion, but I do want the people to be informed. Suffice it to say that Villa, with a file of soldiers, dragged that French woman from her home, took her, screaming, down the street in his automobile, and kept her for four days—Villa himself, personally. That was no act of one of his irresponsible officers or vandals. I am not going to repeat rumor as to what happened to her after that. These facts are verified. This is the man whom the administration has apparently, and undoubtedly sincerely, thought might be used to work out something good for Mexico.

The desire of all of us has been, of course, Mr. President, to prevent the necessity for armed interference by this Government in Mexico; none of us wants a war with Mexico. There can be no war with Mexico. Any war or any action resulting in the sending of our troops to restore order and peace in Mexico would be in the service of the 14,000,000 people of Mexico against a few bandits who have them prostrate by the throat and who are choking out the life of civilization. It would not require any very great augmentation of the forces of the United States to enable us to do it. The time has been since I have been in the Senate and speaking to Members of this body upon this subject when the police force of New York City could have absolutely restored order in Mexico without difficulty and without the spilling of blood. The time has now come when there are 150,000 bandits armed in Mexico, killing one another and killing peaceable, quiet citizens, destroying civilization, and wiping religion out of the country.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. A few moments ago, Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico said that these horrible conditions were known in Mexico; that he himself had known them; and yet he states that the President of the United States has been misinformed. The President of the United States, as I understand, has several times had special commissioners down in Mexico for the purpose of ascertaining the truth, and they have been in communication with these various bandits and leaders. Can the Senator from New Mexico explain how it was that the President, under those circumstances, could have been so misinformed? Are not the facts that the Senator has been relating to the Senate generally known in Mexico?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, they are generally known in Mexico, and they are generally known wherever anything is known at all about Mexican affairs. There is no question about that. The difficulty, as nearly as I can see it, is that the President is not correctly informed or is misinformed by his personal representatives. For instance, his personal representative whom he had there, Mr. Lind, came back here, took an encyclopedia, and wrote a history of Mexico by copying off the article in the encyclopedia, as I recall it; and I am informed—I do not know how true it is—that Mr. Lind told the President of the United States that if he would send the marines and sailors to Vera Cruz, we could land there, take the post office, the railroad yards, and the customhouse without firing a shot; that there would be no attempt to drive us away or to keep us from that soil; that there would not be a drop of blood spilled; and that, if we held on, we could make Huerta get out of the country. I know nothing of the actual truth of this. I have been informed on what I consider to be good authority that that was the report made by Mr. Lind. I know that Members of Congress have come to me here to seek information concerning Mexico,

thinking I knew something about it, and have made statements to me as coming directly from Mr. Lind within five minutes, that he was here and had said to them certain things concerning the matter; for instance, that Pancho Villa was now studying metaphysics and reading several volumes of philosophy, and statements of that kind; that really the man was educating himself and was developing a great interest in deep subjects, such as philosophy and metaphysics. I think one of them told me the names of the volumes which had been mentioned, and asked me if I thought that it was possible. They did not understand. I asked if Mr. Lind had said that he knew Mr. Villa or had ever met Mr. Villa. The Representative returned later and informed me that Lind admitted that he had never been farther north than Tampico; that he had never met Villa in his life; that he did not know anything about him; but he did give the name of his informant, and that informant was a representative of one of the greatest foreign oil companies in the world.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FALL. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Following up the question asked by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether evidence of the incident that he has just related in regard to Villa in the City of Mexico—I suppose the Senator has the evidence that satisfies him of the truth of the incident, for he has said very positively that it was true—has been placed in possession of our Government; and if it has not, why does not the Senator communicate it to our State Department?

Mr. FALL. I have been informed, on what I regard to be absolutely good authority, that these statements I have made can be verified from the State Department. I have so heard.

Mr. NORRIS. That that information is now in the hands of the State Department?

Mr. FALL. I think so; yes. I do not want to betray any confidence, but I think that information is in the hands of the State Department, placed there possibly officially by representatives of foreign Governments.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FALL. With pleasure.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator is perhaps better acquainted with the Mexican situation than is any other Senator in the United States Senate. He is thoroughly acquainted with the modern history of that country and with the character of its people. We all agree, I think, or most of us do at least, about the initial mistake that was made in Mexican affairs; but that is a matter that has passed, and we can not retrace our steps in regard to it. I should like, however, to ask the Senator's view as to what this Government ought now to do under present conditions in reference to interference or with reference to letting the matter work itself out?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I will answer unhesitatingly, as I have answered before that same question, to the best of my ability. Up to the time that mediation was asked by this Government through the Argentine, Brazilian, and Chilean representatives I would not have made this answer.

I have been one of those, Mr. President, who believed in the absolute supremacy of the United States of America on this continent; that it was our duty to ourselves and to those who had gone before us and made this Government to let it be understood all over the world that we carried no chip on our shoulders and desired no territory by conquest; that we were not posing as the owners or the rulers of this hemisphere, but that we did propose to notify the entire world, including the nations on this continent, that the United States was supreme and would forever remain the supreme power on this continent. That has been my position heretofore.

Frankly, I am willing to say to you now, Mr. President, that since mediation has been attempted, and the mediators attempted so sincerely to discharge their duties, if I were President of the United States, I would call the same representatives together and say to them, "Now, let us agree to stop this trouble in Mexico; you are interested as well as we; we have shown that our interests here are identical in the maintenance of neutrality in this great world war; you have called upon us to assist you and join you in matters of that kind. Now, we are willing to join you, and we want to request that you shall join us in settling this difficulty in Mexico, which eventually is going to precipitate a great war upon this continent if it is not settled." I would ask those three nations to join us. I would say to them, "Now, you people know the conditions in your Latin-American countries," for I would say to you frankly,

sir, that I realize that each one of the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile knows exactly how to deal with the character of crowd that is on top in Mexico.

Do you suppose that these people are the representatives of 80 per cent of their population of which the President speaks? They are the representatives of the intelligence and the intellect of their countries; they are the representatives of law and order, the representatives of religion and of civilization itself in their respective countries. If we had adopted their suggestions and invited them to make further suggestions and adopted those suggestions in the settlement of the Mexican troubles, we would have had them settled long ago. I would now invite them to participate in the settlement of the difficulty.

In my judgment it will be necessary for us to have a police force in Mexico to enforce the orders of the A. B. C. in that country; but if the A. B. C. said that they were not ready to do that, and asked us to do so, I would furnish a United States police force. I would invite them to go in with us and join us in the undertaking; but, having started in, I would establish peace from Yucatan to El Paso and from Guaymas to Tampico, and I would see that it was maintained. The cry of the pacifists or of the sentimentalists that the Mexican people should be allowed to spill blood from now until eternity, and that it is none of our business to interfere with them, would not for one moment cause me to hesitate in dealing with Mexico as it should be dealt with, not only in the interest of civilization itself, Mr. President, but in the interest of the eventual safety and the peace of this country of ours. Why, I will say to you, sir, that just so sure as we have foreign troubles of any kind, you will see that the threatening point, the danger point, will come from the Republic to the south of us. If we do not control it and put an end to the present situation, we will have trouble on that account with other nations of the earth.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, if I may ask the Senator another question—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield further to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FALL. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator's own opinion is, then, that sooner or later intervention must come, and that when it does come, it should come through the cooperation of at least three South American countries and the United States acting jointly?

Mr. FALL. Through their cooperation, if they will give it, and through their advice, and by our action if they will not cooperate with us. I believe they would cooperate.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the Senator further believes that the sooner we start in on that program the better?

Mr. FALL. The sooner we start in on it the better for civilization, the better for our own people, and the better for our country, because everyone must realize that we are now in a critical position so far as foreign affairs are concerned, not only from the west but possibly from the east. We are no longer in a position of magnificent isolation. Mr. President, that is what I have dreaded all the time, and I have been trying sincerely and honestly in my poor way to impress upon the mind of the Senator who has just spoken to me and upon the minds of the other Senators here that if we let Mexican affairs drift it means a foreign war as well as an actual war with Mexico sooner or later.

Mr. President, I am not going to refer to the last speech, which I have here before me, of the President of the United States on this subject, because I know that he was then speaking not as the President of the United States but as the partisan leader of his party. When he spoke with reference to Mexico I am satisfied, I am confident, that he did not intend or desire to have it understood that he was then speaking as President of the United States, but simply that he was speaking as the leader of a party. No President of the United States, entertaining the views which Mr. Wilson must entertain, referring to the accounts in the newspapers criticizing him for his watchful-waiting policy, could have uttered any such expressions as he uttered there when he said "Woodrow chuckled."

Woodrow could not have meant that he was chuckling over occurrences in Mexico or over the success of his policy. The President of the United States, then speaking as a partisan, may have chuckled over the fact that the criticisms of his "watchful waiting" policy had had no more political effect than to reduce the majority in the House of Representatives from 165 or 170 down to 25 or 30. It was a congratulatory chuckle incident to the result of the election. It could not have been any chuckle from the President of the United States that he had not been forced, despite criticism, to intervene in Mexico, when the papers were constantly referring to some of the outrages that I have mentioned here, to the killing of our own marines, the killing of 200 poor deluded Mexicans, who

thought that Huerta was President of Mexico and that they were defending him at Vera Cruz. There could not, of course, have been any chuckle from the President of the United States over conditions or facts of that character. So I will not refer to it; I will not read it. I am not going to inject politics into the discussion or make a political speech.

Now, Mr. President, I shall close. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who has charge of the pending appropriation bill, has listened with a great deal of patience, and yet naturally with some impatience, as he desires to carry the bill through. But, Mr. President, I say to you, sir, that this country needs an adequate Army; it needs a nucleus around which it can gather enough men, not to conquer Mexico, but to restore peace and maintain order there; a nucleus around which we can gather sufficient force to eject other people in the future, not from the Golden State coast possibly, but from the friendly soil of a country which is to-day a wreck so far as government or civilization is concerned.

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in charge of the pending bill to allow its consideration to be suspended for a moment and yield to me to submit a report on the pension appropriation bill and ask for its present consideration? I think its consideration will take only a few moments.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. SHIVELY. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, to report it without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 1018) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It contains no new or general legislation. It is purely an appropriation bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it reported just as it came from the House?

Mr. SHIVELY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, but I should like to have a copy of it if it is available.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Let the bill be read.

Mr. SHIVELY. Let the bill be read. It is very short.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, namely:

For Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, \$164,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

For fees and expenses of examining surgeons, pensions, for services rendered within the fiscal year 1916, \$100,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions without amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana how that total compares with the total of last year.

Mr. SHIVELY. The bill carries \$5,050,000 less than the amount appropriated last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the head of "Office of the Chief of Staff," in the item of appropriation for "Contingencies, military information section, General Staff Corps," on page 3, line 2, after the word "newspapers," to insert "drafting and messenger service"; in line 5, after the name "Manila," to insert "the cost of special instruction at home and abroad and in maintenance of students and attachés; and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper"; and in line 12, after the word "appropriation," to insert "And provided, That military attachés abroad under orders from the Secretary of War shall be

allowed mileage and actual expenses for sea travel under existing laws for travel abroad under competent orders, and all accounts for mileage for such travel performed during the fiscal years 1914 and 1915 shall, if otherwise correct, be allowed and passed by the accounting officers of the Treasury," so as to make the clause read:

Contingencies, military information section, General Staff Corps: For contingent expenses of the military information section, General Staff Corps, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference; periodicals and newspapers; drafting and messenger service; and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad; and of the branch office of the military information section at Manila; the cost of special instruction at home and abroad and in maintenance of students and attachés; and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$11,000: *Provided*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation: *And provided*, That military attachés abroad under orders from the Secretary of War shall be allowed mileage and actual expenses for sea travel under existing laws, for travel abroad under competent orders; and all accounts for mileage for such travel performed during the fiscal years 1914 and 1915 shall, if otherwise correct, be allowed and passed by the accounting officers of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator having the bill in charge if that is not changing the present policy of the department—in allowing travel pay for the attachés?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Measurably it is; but there are various men now in the service on the Continent representing this Government in the zone of war, and they are sent from one place to another, and there is no provision for any travel pay for them.

Mr. SMOOT. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that that class of attachés ought to be provided for in the bill; but this takes care of those attachés traveling at any time during the fiscal year 1914; which means, of course, at any time between June 30, 1913, and June 30, 1914.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They have been in the actual service of the Government during that time, too. I will read what the Secretary says about it if the Senator would like to hear it.

Mr. SMOOT. If it is not too long, I would.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is not lengthy. He explains this more briefly than it would be possible for me to make the statement. He says:

The act making appropriation for contingencies, military information section, General Staff Corps, for the fiscal years 1914 and 1915, provided for the payment of actual and necessary traveling expenses, incurred by the military attachés abroad under orders from the Secretary of War. The appropriation made was wholly insufficient to defray these expenses, which prior to the passage of this legislation had been paid from funds appropriated for transportation and mileage. Therefore the provision was incorporated above authorizing the payment of such travel from the latter appropriation.

This amendment transfers it to an appropriation in which there will be an adequate sum for paying these men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to insert:

For the actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Army on duty abroad for the purpose of observing operations of armies of foreign States at war, to be paid upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary for obtaining military information, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Army who, after July 1, 1914, have been on duty abroad for the purpose of observing operations of armies of foreign States at war, and of officers who may hereafter be on duty abroad for that purpose, shall be paid out of the appropriation for contingencies of the military information section, General Staff Corps, upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary for obtaining military information; and the amount appropriated for such contingencies by an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved April 27, 1914, is increased to \$26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 19, after the word "Service," to strike out "School"; on page 5, line 5, after "\$35,350," to strike out "for the pay of one translator, at \$100 per month, to be appointed by the commandant of the Army Service Schools, \$1,200," and insert "of which sum not exceeding \$100 per month may be used for the payment of one translator, to be appointed by the commandant of the Army Service Schools, with the approval of the Secretary of War," so as to make the clause read:

United States service schools: To provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Army Service Schools (including the Army Staff College, the Army School of the Line, the Army Field Engineer School, the Army Field Service and Correspondence School for Medical Officers, and the Army Signal School) at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., and the School of Fire for Field Artillery and for the School of Musketry, at Fort Sill, Okla., by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, the purchase of modern instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction, employment of temporary, technical, or special services, and for all other absolutely necessary expenses, to be allotted in such proportions as may, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, be for the best interests of the military service,

\$35,350, of which sum not exceeding \$100 per month may be used for the payment of one translator, to be appointed by the commandant of the Army Service Schools, with the approval of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to:

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

Relief of Lieut. Col. George O. Squier, Signal Corps, United States Army: The Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Lieut. Col. George O. Squier, Signal Corps, United States Army, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$41.46, which amount is hereby appropriated, being the amount of money expended by him as military attaché to the American Embassy at London from an allotment of the appropriation "Contingencies, Military Information Section, General Staff Corps, 1913 and 1914," and which amount was deposited by him in the Treasury of the United States from private funds.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I note that there are several items like this, and I want to ask the chairman of the committee why this lieutenant had to pay this amount out of his private funds into the Treasury of the United States? The amendment says that he expended this money from an allotment of the appropriation "Contingencies, Military Information Section, General Staff Corps." Now, if he had a right to spend it or take it from that fund, why was he required to replace it in the Treasury, thus necessitating our repayment of the amount to him?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that it was on account of an adverse ruling of the comptroller, who held that the money was not properly expended.

Mr. JONES. The comptroller held that he did not have any right to expend it out of that fund, and upon that ruling he replaced it in the Treasury?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes. He expended the money in good faith, as did all of these men. They are small amounts, and the comptroller ruled that the expenditures were not proper, with the result that they are now called upon to pay these small balances to the Government. These amendments are to relieve them of that responsibility.

Mr. JONES. Of course hereafter they will understand that they have no right to expend any money out of this fund, and we will have no more payments of this kind?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, when the chairman of the committee said the comptroller ruled that the payments were not proper, I assume he meant to say that they were not authorized by existing law?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DU PONT. They were proper in themselves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

Relief of First Lieut. Sherman Miles, Field Artillery, United States Army: The Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to First Lieut. Sherman Miles, Field Artillery, United States Army, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$57.95, which amount is hereby appropriated, being the amount of money expended by him as military attaché to the American legation at Bucharest, Roumania, from an allotment of the appropriation "Contingencies, Military Information Section, General Staff Corps, 1913," and which amount was deposited by him in the Treasury of the United States from private funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 13, to insert:

Relief of Matthew E. Hanna, late captain, Tenth Cavalry, United States Army: The Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Matthew E. Hanna, late captain, Tenth Cavalry, United States Army, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$532.18, which amount is hereby appropriated, being the amount of money expended by him as special disbursing agent from an allotment from the appropriation for "Contingencies of the Army, 1912," to pay the unusual and extraordinary official expenses of the special mission of Army officers detailed by the President and the Secretary of War to witness the autumn maneuvers of the German Army in 1911, and which amount was deposited by him in the Treasury of the United States from private funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 4, to insert:

Relief of Maj. Powell C. Fauntleroy, Medical Corps, United States Army: The Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Maj. Powell C. Fauntleroy, Medical Corps, United States Army, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$601.40, which amount is hereby appropriated, being the amount of money expended by him from an allotment of funds of the Quartermaster Corps, 1913, furnished him for the purpose of paying expenditures incurred as an official observer of the War Department of the Turko-Balkan War, and which amount was deposited by him in the Treasury of the United States from private funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 18, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Capt. Henry L. Newbold, Fourth Field Artillery, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are

authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. Henry L. Newbold, Fourth Field Artillery, United States Army, the sum of \$319.37, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 8, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Capt. N. K. Averill, Seventh Cavalry, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. N. K. Averill, Seventh Cavalry, United States Army, the sum of \$39.23, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 7, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Maj. Jesse McI. Carter, Third Cavalry, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Maj. Jesse McI. Carter, Third Cavalry, United States Army, the sum of \$352.23, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 14, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Lieut. Col. T. Bentley Mott, Second Field Artillery, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Lieut. Col. T. Bentley Mott, Second Field Artillery, United States Army, the sum of \$55.33, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 23, after the word "departments," to insert "districts," so as to read:

Contingencies, headquarters of military departments, districts, and tactical commands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 11, before the word "Chief," in the subhead, to insert "under the," so as to make the subhead read:

Under the Chief of Coast Artillery.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Office of the Chief Signal Officer," on page 11, line 7, after the word "otherwise," to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$700,000," so as to make the clause read:

Signal Service of the Army: For expenses of the Signal Service of the Army, as follows: Purchase, equipment, and repair of field electric telegraphs, signal equipments, and stores, binocular glasses, telescopes, heliostats, and other necessary instruments, including necessary meteorological instruments for use on target ranges; war balloons and airships, and accessories, including their maintenance and repair; telephone apparatus (exclusive of exchange service) and maintenance of the same; electrical installations and maintenance at military posts; fire control and direction apparatus and matériel for field artillery; maintenance and repair of military telegraph lines and cables, including salaries of civilian employees, supplies, and general repairs, and other expenses connected with the duty of collecting and transmitting information for the Army by telegraph or otherwise, \$700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 9, after the words "more than," to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$400,000," so as to read:

Provided, however, That not more than \$400,000 of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of airships and other aerial machines and accessories necessary in the aviation section; and for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles, which may be necessary for the aviation section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Pay of officers of the line," on page 12, line 11, after the word "line," to strike out "\$7,800,000" and insert "\$7,850,000: *Provided,* That the President is authorized to retain Maj. Gen. Arthur Murray, United States Army, on the active list of the Army as an additional officer in the grade of major general and as commanding general, Western Department, United States Army, from April 29, 1915, the date on which he would retire from active service under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1882, until the close of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, December 4, 1915, when he shall be retired from active service: *Provided further,* That the number of major generals of the line of the Army on the active list shall be increased by one during the period named, and for that period only," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers of the line, \$7,850,000: *Provided,* That the President is authorized to retain Maj. Gen. Arthur Murray, United States Army, on the active list of the Army as an additional officer in the grade of major general and as commanding general, Western Department, United States Army, from April 29, 1915, the date on which he would retire from active service under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1882, until the close of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, December 4, 1915, when he shall be retired from active service: *Provided further,* That the number of major generals of the line of the Army on the active list shall be increased by one during the period named, and for that period only.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 2, after the word "pay," to strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$1,871,937.35," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers for length of service, to be paid with their current monthly pay, \$1,871,937.35.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Pay of enlisted men," on page 13, line 4, after the word "recruits," to strike out "\$18,200,000" and insert "\$18,300,000: *Provided*, That hereafter pay and allowances shall not accrue to a soldier under sentence of dishonorable discharge, during such period as the execution of the sentence of discharge may be suspended under authority of the act of Congress approved April 27, 1914, and pay which has heretofore been forfeited under such suspended sentence shall not be held to have accrued to the Soldiers' Home under the operation of section 4818, Revised Statutes, but shall be covered back into the Treasury of the United States," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of enlisted men of all grades, including recruits, \$18,300,000: *Provided*, That hereafter pay and allowances shall not accrue to a soldier under sentence of dishonorable discharge during such period as the execution of the sentence of discharge may be suspended under authority of the act of Congress approved April 27, 1914, and pay which has heretofore been forfeited under such suspended sentence shall not be held to have accrued to the Soldiers' Home under the operation of section 4818, Revised Statutes, but shall be covered back into the Treasury of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Hospital Corps," on page 15, line 10, after the word "men," to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,067,736," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of enlisted men, \$1,067,736.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps (enlisted men)," on page 15, line 13, after the word "Corps," to strike out "\$1,150,000" and insert "\$1,276,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of enlisted men, Quartermaster Corps, \$1,276,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary proceeded to read the next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs, which was, beginning at the top of page 16, to strike out all down to and including line 1, on page 17, and to insert certain other words; and the Secretary read to line 20 on page 17.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask that the proviso which the Secretary is now about to read may be passed over until the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] can enter the Chamber. He wishes to be heard on it.

Mr. SMOOT. Unless the Senator having the bill in charge is willing to allow the proviso to be eliminated. If he is, that will hasten the passage of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I assume, however, that that is not the case.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will state that I am not willing to do that. I think we can show that it is not only meritorious but economical.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I wish to give notice to the Senator that it may be passed over at this time, but that whenever it comes up I shall make a point of order against it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to its going over temporarily and being reached a little later in the afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Can the amendment down to the words "Additional pay while on foreign service, \$9,000" be agreed to?

Mr. THOMAS. The amendment down to line 20 on page 17—

Mr. WARREN. I think it had all better go in or stay out.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask that the whole amendment may be passed over, because if any part of it goes out the House provision ought to be restored, and if any part of it goes out it all ought to go out.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; if it all goes out the House provision, with some slight modifications, would have to be reinserted in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. So I am willing that it shall all go over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The entire amendment, then, will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "For pay of officers of the Staff Corps and staff departments," on page 23, line 14, after the word "Corps," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$258,650," so as to make the clause read:

Signal Corps: For pay of the officers of the Signal Corps, \$258,650.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Retired officers," on page 23, line 23, after "\$2,850,000," to insert "*Provided*, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized within two years of the approval of this act, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer to the active list of the Army all officers under 60 years of age who may have been transferred heretofore for physical disability from the active to the retired list of the Army by the action of any retiring board: *Provided*, That such officer shall be transferred to the place on the active list which he would have had if he had not been retired or to which he had passed a satisfactory examination for promotion, and shall be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he may be transferred or at any time thereafter promoted: *And provided further*, That such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination for promotion as now provided for by law," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of officers on the retired list and for officers who may be placed thereon during the current year, \$2,850,000: *Provided*, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized within two years of the approval of this act, etc.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge to explain that proviso and what effect it will have. How many officers, if he can state, will be affected by it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think only a few will be affected by it. The purpose of it is to provide for the restoration to service of those officers who have been retired by the retiring board for ill health or otherwise and who have subsequently entirely recovered. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] is entirely familiar with the provision and the number it will affect.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I offered the amendment in the Committee on Military Affairs, and it was adopted and now stands in the bill as an amendment reported by the committee.

I should like to say that this amendment is intended to provide a general method for the restoration to the active list of a few retired officers in regard to whom justice requires that some action be taken, and in whose behalf several special bills are now pending, some of which have passed the Senate and are now in the House.

The fact is that there are several officers in the Army who, on their return from the Philippines or other tropical regions, were ordered in the past, against their will, before a retiring board, were reported as permanently unfit for active service and placed on the retired list of the Army. Several of these men have entirely recovered their health, and it does not seem right, because three medical officers make a mistake in their diagnosis, that the professional careers of these officers should be ruined. The principles of ordinary justice seem to require their restoration.

The bill is so framed that it does not interfere with the rights of any officers who are now on the active list, because the officers restored are to be supernumary officers. It is also to be observed that the Government is paying three-fourths pay to the retired officers who would be affected by the amendment, which involves an increase of only 25 per cent in their pay, and that the restored officers would be available for any duty which they may be required to perform, whereas retired officers are available for only certain limited and restricted duties.

I think the principle of the amendment is entirely sound, just, and proper, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 16, after the word "pay," to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$460,000," so as to make the clause read:

For additional pay to such officers for length of service, to be paid with their current monthly pay, \$460,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Retired enlisted men," on page 24, line 25, after the word "list," to strike out "\$2,850,000" and insert "\$2,905,720," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of the enlisted men of the Army on the retired list, \$2,905,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 25, after line 6, to strike out "For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, taking depositions, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending the same, \$40,000," and insert "For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending the same, and ex-

penses of taking depositions, and securing other evidence for use before the same, \$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending the same, and expenses of taking depositions, and securing other evidence for use before the same, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 18, after the word "men," to strike out "\$440,000" and insert "\$640,000," so as to make the clause read:

For commutation of quarters, and of heat and light, to commissioned officers, acting dental surgeons, veterinarians, pay clerks, nurses (female), and enlisted men, \$640,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 3, after the word "duty," to strike out:

Provided further, That not more than the rate now allowed by law shall be paid in any case.

And insert:

Provided further, That hereafter heat and light for the authorized allowance of quarters of commissioned officers, acting dental surgeons, veterinarians, pay clerks, nurses (female), and enlisted men, when on duty where there are no public quarters available, will be commuted at rates fixed by the Secretary of War and paid with and as a part of commutation of quarters, which rates shall, as nearly as possible, be commuted upon a reimbursable basis.

Mr. OVERMAN. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is new legislation.

Mr. WARREN. I should like to be heard a moment on the point of order. Will the Senator state his point of order?

Mr. OVERMAN. The point of order is that this is a matter fixed by law, and the amendment proposes to strike out the part that is fixed in the law and to give the Secretary of War the discretion. In other words, they are attempting to get around the decision of the Auditor of the Treasury and allow him full discretion to allow what he pleases in the way of compensation.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps the Senator has not examined the original law. The law provides that—

Hereafter the heat and light actually necessary for the authorized allowance of quarters for officers and enlisted men shall be furnished at the expense of the United States under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

The power is delegated to the Secretary of War to arrange that which he has to do as between the different zones. I understand the difference the Senator alluded to which occurred between the comptroller and the War Department has been arranged satisfactorily by the adoption of the amount that shall be paid in different zones.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no reason for a difference of \$200,000.

Mr. WARREN. There is not.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course if you turn it over and \$200,000 is appropriated in the appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. The appropriation bill does not give an increase of \$200,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not talking about the increase. If the President pleases, lines 3 and 4 speak for themselves:

Provided further, That not more than the rate now allowed by law shall be paid in any case.

Then it goes on to say that the Secretary of War shall have the discretion which repeals the law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In other words there is a substitution of a new law for the present law.

Mr. OVERMAN. Exactly.

Mr. WARREN. How does the Senator explain his point when this is already in the law, provided that it shall be arranged by the regulation of the War Department?

Mr. OVERMAN. Why did you strike out the proviso?

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the law now? Will the Senator from Wyoming read it?

Mr. WARREN. I will read the law, and then I will read the amendment. This is the way the law reads:

Hereafter fuel may be furnished to commissioned officers on the active list by the Quartermaster's Department, for the actual use of such officers only, at the rate of \$3 per cord for standard oak wood, or at an equivalent rate for other kinds of fuel, the amount so furnished to each to be limited to the officer's actual personal necessities as certified to by him.

That was the act of June 12, 1906. By a later act, March 2, 1907, it is provided that—

Hereafter the heat and light actually necessary for the authorized allowance of quarters for officers and enlisted men—

Enlisted men were not included in the first.

Mr. OVERMAN. Right there are the words "actually necessary."

Mr. WARREN (reading)—

shall be furnished at the expense of the United States under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

That is the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the amendment is subject to a point of order. This is not furnishing; it is commuting. It is permitting the officer to furnish it himself and commute it. The law reads that the Government shall furnish it. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Before that is done I wish to say that the objection urged here was really urged by the comptroller, but they finally reached an agreement. The comptroller was of the opinion that the amount which was being charged or allowed was larger than it ought to be. So they got together, as the Senator from Wyoming said, and arranged a schedule of fees and agreed upon the specific provision in the law as it is. I do not know whether the Senator from North Carolina has been advised or not, but they have agreed upon a tabulated statement.

Mr. OVERMAN. When was that agreed to? That has nothing to do with the law. The Secretary of War and the auditor can not make a law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from North Carolina need not tell me that. Nobody made such an insistence as that.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know the Senator does not say that. I beg his pardon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is so essential that I feel like expressing a hope that the Senator from North Carolina will withdraw his point of order. I wish to read from the House hearings. When the bill was before the House they inserted the proviso to which attention has been called by the Senator from North Carolina:

Provided further, That not more than the rate now allowed by law shall be paid in any case.

That was inserted on the floor of the House. The Senate committee struck it out and amended it by inserting the provision to which objection is now made. It is in the estimates, too. I am not going to quarrel with the decision of the Chair, but I think, with the Senator from Wyoming, that there is a law on the subject now. Anyhow, at the expense of tiring the Senate, I wish to call attention to Gen. Aleshire's testimony before the House committee. He says:

Mr. Chairman, in response to your request to explain that item—

That is the item we are just discussing now—

more than a year ago there were some questions as to the rental of buildings for quarters and the payment of heat and light allowances, brought up by the auditor and comptroller. The Secretary of War directed that the matter be fully investigated, and it was put in the hands of an officer of the Inspector General's Department. Investigation was completed, I think, about last June, or shortly afterwards.

The matter was a subject of dispute at that time between the different departments:

The Secretary of War went over these reports, and so did I, as Quartermaster General, and it was noted that the inspector dwelt upon the hardships and inequalities imposed upon enlisted men by the existing system and stated that in his opinion satisfactory relief can only be obtained by legislation fixing a flat money commutation of quarters and heat and light for officers and enlisted men whenever the Government does not provide them with public quarters.

The Secretary of War in his review of this case directed that we take the matter up with a view to obtaining necessary legislation and confer with the comptroller with a view to getting his views and so that he might see the result of that investigation.

I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to this:

Informal conference was held with the comptroller, and several drafts of a bill to accomplish the desired end were prepared in the office of the Quartermaster General and Judge Advocate General, and finally the draft that is included in the estimate was submitted—that draft. I understand that the comptroller concurred in the suggestion to commute heat and light as well as quarters, and generally in the proviso as drafted.

That is the proviso which is in the bill and the provision that is now in the law, I insist, in opposition to the ruling of the Chair, but I do not expect to get him to overrule it, is a part of the law, and the result of it was reached and the draft framed in pursuance of an agreement made by the Secretary of War, the comptroller, and the Quartermaster General.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not care to go into an argument on this matter. I could speak for half an hour on it, but I do not care to do it. The amendment is out of order, and I think the Chair has ruled correctly.

Mr. WARREN. I presume the Senator does not want to take me off the floor.

Mr. OVERMAN. I did not know the Senator had the floor.

Mr. WARREN. With the testimony that the Senator from Oregon has just read, attention was invited by the Quarter-

master General to the fact that the enlisted men of the Marine Corps on similar duties would receive, according to law, commutation of fuel at the rate of \$9 a month at first and \$8 a month afterwards, and commutation of quarters at a rate per month, and so forth. In other words, this amendment, if adopted, would simply place the Army on the same basis as the Navy, and of course an enlisted man ought to have the same rights as an officer when he is detailed on duty where he is compelled to hire a room and pay for light and heat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not the point with the Chair. The point with the Chair is that the law provides that the Government shall furnish it. This says that it shall be commuted. That is a change of the law.

Mr. WARREN. I am not differing with the Chair. The Chair has ruled that it is to go out on a point of order. I hope before the bill is finished there will be a way provided to cover the desired end.

Mr. OVERMAN. They should have the necessary light, but I am told that a few officers up here at the Highlands Hotel receive more money for light and fuel, just for their commutation, than it takes to light the hotel and heat it.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the chairman whether he understands the increase of \$200,000 is due to the amendment in question? I understand that there will be an increase necessary in any event, even with the House provision.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is just one other matter, if the Senator from Utah will allow me, with reference to the law as it now stands, and that is what the Chair is basing his ruling on. I really do not think the Chair grasped the situation, because there is a law.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a law for commutation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is a law for commutation now. You will find it on the page preceding the one now under discussion.

What is under discussion now is simply a proviso to the law as it always existed. The bill reads:

For commutation of quarters and of heat and light to commissioned officers, acting dental surgeons, veterinarians, pay clerks, nurses (female), and enlisted men.

That is also the language of the law, and it has been in force for years past. That is what I am claiming. I repeat, it is a part of the bill and is also a part of the law as it now stands.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to see the law.

Mr. WARREN. The language is precisely the same as that used heretofore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asked for the law; it was handed to him, and he ruled on the question.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought it was fair to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to that and to the latter part in parenthesis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. From what is the Senator from Oregon reading?

Mr. OVERMAN. It is the bill itself from which the Senator is reading.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the standing law; that is a part of this bill. I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. But it is exactly the language of last year's law.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be, but that was an appropriation bill; it is not a permanent statute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a statute of the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I insist that nearly all the laws, nearly all the affirmative legislation on the statute books affecting the Army have been engrafted in appropriation bills, and so this is in a former appropriation bill. The language in this bill is simply a copy of that with a proviso added to it; in other words, there is a law on the subject, and we are now simply proposing to add a proviso to the law as it stands.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understand that the increase from \$440,000, proposed on page 25, line 18, to \$640,000, was occasioned by the proviso which has just been ruled out of order.

Mr. WARREN. It has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. DU PONT. No; it has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will excuse me, even if it had to do with it, as to the words under discussion now, I will state to the Senator from Utah that he has not stated the facts correctly, because there has been a reduction instead of an increase.

Mr. SMOOT. The House provided \$440,000 and the Senate committee has reported to increase it to \$640,000, an increase of \$200,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; but there have been reductions in other features of the bill covered by this very law. While

the amount here has been increased to \$640,000, there has been a reduction in the amount estimated for barracks and quarters of \$38,500 and a reduction of the amount that was estimated for regular supplies of \$58,700, the total being \$97,200.

Mr. SMOOT. But the Senator misunderstood me, or perhaps I did not express myself clearly enough. The House provision is:

For commutation of quarters, and of heat and light, to commissioned officers, acting dental surgeons, veterinarians, pay clerks, nurses (female), and enlisted men, \$440,000.

The Senate committee provides for the same purposes \$640,000, an increase of \$200,000. There must be some reason for that increase.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will find all the amounts before him. They have been increased over the estimates, and the House acted on those estimates. The increase has no reference to this proviso whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not speaking of the previous increases; I am speaking of this particular increase.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator charges that this increase is made because of the proviso, which I deny.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I asked the question whether this particular increase of \$200,000 had not been made necessary by the proviso on page 26 which has been just ruled out of order.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I understand that if this amendment, which the Senate committee has reported, be stricken out and if the text of the provision as it came from the House stands, we still shall have to make an increase of over \$440,000, because the House has cut below the proper estimate.

Mr. SMOOT. How much will you have to increase it?

Mr. DU PONT. The chairman of the committee has the details. I think it ought to be increased to some extent.

Mr. OVERMAN. Regular order!

Mr. SMOOT. I am willing to let the matter go to conference; but I repeat that I understood the increase was on account of this proviso.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 26, line 17, after "\$100,000," to strike out "and so much as may be necessary to pay back such deposits," so as make the clause read:

For interest on soldiers' deposits, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Now that the proviso has been eliminated, it seems to me that the Senator having the bill in charge should ask for a reconsideration of the amendment on the same page, lines 3, 4, and 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was not agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. I made a point of order against all of it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Did I understand the Chair to say that he did not understand that there was any law on the subject?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been unable to find it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will give it to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In what year was the act passed?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Last year.

Mr. OVERMAN. That was on an appropriation bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly. The Senator must admit that nearly all affirmative legislation affecting the Army has been engrafted on appropriation bills. There has practically been no legislation, unfortunately for the Army, unless it has been put on the different appropriation bills. This is a part of the law now. I will read it to you, Mr. President, and then I will send the statute to the desk. It is in the bill of last year, and is as follows:

For commutation of quarters to commissioned officers, acting dental surgeons, and veterinarians and pay clerks on duty without troops at stations where there are no public quarters, \$450,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On what page is that?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will send the law up to the desk. The language I refer to is marked on page 9. I say, with that law in force, Mr. President, this proviso is entirely in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT (after examining). This can not change the opinion of the Chair, as it was on an appropriation bill passed last year. It reads:

For commutation of quarters to commissioned officers, acting dental surgeons, and veterinarians and pay clerks on duty without troops at stations where there are no public quarters, \$450,000.

That was an appropriation of \$450,000 to pay for commutation of quarters. There is a general law which provides that the

Government shall furnish light and fuel for such officers. This amendment reads:

Provided further, That hereafter heat and light for the authorized allowance of quarters of commissioned officers, acting dental surgeons, veterinarians, pay clerks, nurses (female), and enlisted men, when on duty where there are no public quarters available, will be commuted at rates fixed by the Secretary of War.

The two are, to the mind of the Chair, clearly distinguishable. The ruling of the Chair stands unless there is an appeal.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 27, line 9, before the word "cable," to strike out "Washington-Alaskan" and insert "Washington-Alaska military," so as to make the clause read:

For extra pay to enlisted men of the line of the Army and to enlisted men of the Signal Corps employed in the Territory of Alaska on the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system, for periods of not less than 10 days, at the rate of 35 cents per day, \$30,744.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 9, after the word "misconduct," to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$70,000," so as to make the clause read:

For six months' additional pay to beneficiaries of officers and enlisted men who die while in active service from wounds or disease not the result of their own misconduct, \$70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 15, after the word "mounts," to strike out "\$190,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

For additional pay to officers below the grade of major required to be mounted and who furnish their own mounts, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 5, before the word "Regiment," to strike out "Provisional," so as to make the clause read:

For Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, composed of two battalions of four companies each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to strike out:

Provided, That the permanent captains of the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry shall be recommissioned as captains of Infantry of the United States Army, to take rank on the lineal list of officers of Infantry immediately after the junior officers of the same grade whose total commissioned service equals or exceeds theirs.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not he has been able to give consideration to the proposed amendment to the proviso, instead of striking it out, which I offered here and which is printed and of which, I think, a copy has been furnished the Senator.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have not had an opportunity, I will say to the Senator, to discuss it with the members of the committee as yet, but I will do so before the bill is concluded.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I understand that the committee is not hostile to the suggestion that the captains of the Porto Rico Regiment be given an opportunity of professional advancement. That is the object of the amendment of which I have given notice. I hope the matter will, at least, go to conference, where I understand the chairman of the committee will try to make some provision which will give them an opportunity for advancement and which will not interfere with the regular advancement of other officers. That would be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think probably that can be worked out. The reason why the provision was stricken out by the Senate committee was that its effect was to transfer from the Porto Rico Regiment 11 officers, and in many cases retard the promotion of men now in the regular line. I think probably we can adjust it if the matter goes to conference, as it will go to conference anyway if the provision is stricken out as reported by the committee.

Mr. SAULSBURY. So I understand. I trust the chairman will endeavor to have some similar provision adopted, but I do not wish to insist upon my amendment now.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. We will try to do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I was engaged out of the Chamber on matters requiring my attention for a short while, and in my absence the amendment on page 17 was passed over. I desire to make a point of order against that amendment, beginning with line 2, on page 17, and extending to line 17, on page 20.

This is simply a provision to place on the retired list at half pay civil-service employees in the War Department who are 65 years of age. It is an astounding provision to incorporate in an appropriation bill, and I am very much surprised to see it here. If we are to create a civil pension list in the United States, it should be done with great care and after very mature consideration by the committees of the Senate and of the other House authorized to consider such measures. I therefore made the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order can be noted as pending, unless the chairman of the committee desires to go back to the amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I understand, Mr. President, that the Senator from Kansas can not be here very well to-night, and I am perfectly willing to accommodate him by returning to the item. I may say, in order to save time, a word about this matter, and then I will submit the question to the ruling of the Chair.

I think the point of order would probably lie, but the question of the reclassification of the clerks has been under discussion for a long while. There were two bills introduced in the Senate on behalf of the clerks and employees of this department, some of whom were not and could not be justly treated under the law as it is. When those particular bills were introduced on behalf of the clerks—and they had the approval of the employees all down the line—they went to the Committee on Military Affairs and were by that committee referred to the Secretary of War for his report. The result was that the Secretary appointed a committee of five, consisting of three officers of the Army and two representatives of the clerks, who took the bills which were introduced in behalf of the clerks and worked out this proposition, which was satisfactory to the War Department as well as to the clerks. They came back to the committee and discussed it at length, and every branch of the service was satisfied with this provision as it now appears in the bill.

The objection of the Senator from Kansas is that it will create a civil pension list. It has that effect in a modified form; and yet I say, Mr. President, without fear of contradiction, that if such a system could be introduced in all of the departments it would result in efficiency of service. For instance, the old, superannuated employees who have reached the age of 65 or 70 years are drawing the higher rates of pay, and there is no way to get rid of them except to ruthlessly turn them out on the streets. The effect of this provision, if allowed to remain in the bill, would be to permit the old, superannuated men and women to be placed, if you please to call it so, on a civil pension list on half pay—enough to support them in their declining years—and to use the other half of their salary for the payment of clerks entering the service at the initial pay, the half so paid in every case being sufficient to meet the salaries of the new employees; in other words, infusing lifeblood into the department and at the same time retiring the old men.

Mr. DU PONT. And, Mr. President, without costing the Government one cent more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Notwithstanding the statement of the value of the legislation as set forth by the chairman of the committee, that statement in itself is an admission that it is general legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, before we pass from the matter, in answer to the statement of the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the committee, I desire to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to the creation of a civil pension list in the United States. I am not willing to put on a pension list Government clerks who have received more pay during a long series of years for shorter hours than nine-tenths of the people of the United States receive for the labor they perform. I am not willing to tax people in the United States who draw less than \$50 or \$60 a month year after year for their labor, to establish a pension roll for clerks and employees who have received more pay every month of their lives since they have been in Government service than by far the greater part of the American people receive. I do not look with any patience upon any plan that seeks to tax men who work with their hands for from \$40 to \$50 or \$60 a month, in order to pension people who have received two, three, or four times that much, and whose jobs the men so taxed would have been delighted to have if there had been any way by which they could get them.

If this scheme were justified as to one department, it would be justified as to every other department of the Government; in the Postal Service, and in every other service; and you would be saddling upon the people of the United States an enormous expenditure and requiring them to bear a pension burden which in time would be larger than that which results from the Military Establishment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, relating to what the Senator from Kansas has said, I will say that I gave my support to placing this amendment on the bill in order to bring the question before the Senate, to ascertain what the idea of the Senate is as to civil pensions. We all know there has been a great deal of talk about the matter, especially in the newspapers; and we know that many corporations have provided pensions for their superannuated employees.

I myself believe in a contributory pension system, under which the men benefited will themselves contribute to the payments. This plan seemed to be less objectionable, if objectionable at all, than any other proposition which has come before us. However, as the Senator from Kansas has said, if it can be made applicable to the War Department, it is just as adaptable to every other department of the Government. My idea was to bring it before the Senate for their attention.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I fail to see how the contention of the Senator from Kansas can be sustained, because the amendment does not saddle the country with any additional expense. The half pay that is cut off from these retiring clerks is simply applied to the new clerks that are appointed, so that the country will not have to pay an additional dollar if the amendment is adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Subsistence of the Army," on page 34, line 12, after the word "Army," to insert "\$10,045,894.25," and in line 20, after the word "Corps," to strike out "\$9,840,000," so as to read:

For providing prizes to be established by the Secretary of War for enlisted men of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers and cooks, the total amount of such prizes at the various schools not to exceed \$900 per annum; for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army, \$10,045,894.25: *Provided further*, That the officers and enlisted men of the Navy and the Marine Corps shall be permitted to purchase subsistence supplies at the same price as is charged the officers and the enlisted men of the Army; and the officers and the enlisted men of the Army shall be permitted to purchase subsistence supplies from the Navy and Marine Corps at the same price as is charged the officers and the enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have just conferred with the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill, and it is agreeable to him, as it is to other Senators present, that we shall have a short executive session, after which to return to legislative session. If there be no objection, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Regular Supplies, Quartermaster Corps," on page 36, line 23, after the word "reports," to insert "\$7,746,715.44," so as to read:

For remounts and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; for seeds and implements required for the raising of forage at remount depots and on military reservations in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands, and for labor and expenses incident thereto; for straw for soldiers' bedding, stationery, typewriters and exchange of same, including blank books and blank forms for the Quartermaster Corps, certificates for discharged soldiers, and for printing department orders and reports, \$7,746,715.44.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 1, after the word "paid," to strike out "\$7,732,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the funds received from such sales and in payment for such laundry work shall be used to defray the cost of operation of said ice, laundry, and electric plants, and the sales and expenditures herein provided for shall be accounted for in accordance with the methods prescribed by law, and any sums remaining after such cost of maintenance and operation have been defrayed shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of operation of such plant is paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Incidental expenses, Quartermaster Corps," on page 39, line 23, after the word "department," to insert "\$1,891,463.21"; on page 40, line 2, after the word "barracks," to insert "and the duty now devolved by existing law upon the board of commissioners respecting the government and control of the United States military prison, the semiannual inspections, the framing

of regulations, and the submitting of reports shall hereafter be performed by the Secretary of War or by such officers as he may designate"; and in line 17, after the word "prescribe," to strike out "\$1,853,000," so as to read:

For the following expenditures required for the several regiments of Cavalry, the batteries of Field Artillery, and such companies of Infantry and Scouts as may be mounted, the authorized number of officers' horses, and for the trains, to wit, hire of veterinary surgeons, purchase of medicines for horses and mules, picket ropes, blacksmith's tools and materials, horseshoes and blacksmith's tools for the Cavalry service, and for the shoeing of horses and mules; chests and issue outfits; and such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operations of the Army, and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other department, \$1,891,463.21: *Provided*, That the United States military prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., shall hereafter be known as the United States disciplinary barracks and the branches of said prison as branches of such barracks, and the duty now devolved by existing law upon the board of commissioners respecting the government and control of the United States military prison, the semiannual inspections, the framing of regulations, and the submitting of reports shall hereafter be performed by the Secretary of War or by such officers as he may designate: *Provided further*, That the authority now vested in the Secretary of War to give an honorable restoration to duty, in case the same is merited, to general prisoners confined in the United States disciplinary barracks and its branches shall be extended so that such restoration may be given to general prisoners confined elsewhere, and the Secretary of War shall be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish a system of parole for prisoners confined in said barracks and its branches, the terms and conditions of such parole to be such as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, etc.," on page 41, line 3, after the word "employees," to insert "\$495,120," so as to read:

Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, etc.: For the purchase of horses of ages, sex, and size as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War for remounts, for officers entitled to public mounts, for the Cavalry, Artillery, Signal Corps, and Engineers, the United States Military Academy, service schools, and staff colleges, and for the Indian scouts, and for such Infantry and members of the Hospital Corps in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto, and for the hire of employees, \$495,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 22, after the word "place," to strike out "And provided further, That the Secretary of War is authorized to expend \$2,110.32, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the amount appropriated herein, for the completion of the purchase of certain lands included in the reservation of the Front Royal (Va.) Remount Depot, which was acquired under authority of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1911, namely, tracts 22, 25, and 28, aggregating 193½ acres, more or less, and for the release of all claims against the United States for the use and occupation thereof, the said sum being the amount necessary to complete the purchase of the said tracts under the proposed compromise of the suit now pending for the condemnation of the same, \$495,120," so as to read:

Provided, That the number of horses purchased under this appropriation, added to the number now on hand, shall be limited to the actual needs of the mounted service, including reasonable provisions for remounts, and, unless otherwise ordered by the Secretary of War, no part of this appropriation shall be paid out for horses not purchased by contract after competition duly invited by the Quartermaster Corps and an inspection under the direction and authority of the Secretary of War. When practicable, horses shall be purchased in open market at all military posts or stations, when needed, at a maximum price to be fixed by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any horse below the standard set by Army Regulations for Cavalry and Artillery horses, except when purchased as remounts or for instruction of cadets at the United States Military Academy: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for polo ponies except for West Point Military Academy, and such ponies shall not be used at any other place.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, at the time this amendment was inserted by the committee we had no evidence at all of the purpose of it, nor any estimate. We have since had an estimate sent us and a statement submitted by the Secretary of War. I ask that that amendment be disagreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, in the item of appropriation for barracks and quarters, on page 43, line 9, after the word "tents," insert "\$2,067,558.60," and in line 16, after the word "War," to strike out "\$2,000,000," so as to read:

For the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits; for such furniture for the public rooms of officers' messes and for officers' quarters at military posts as may be approved by the Secretary of War; for wall lockers in permanent barracks, and refrigerators in barracks and quarters; for screen doors, window screens, storm doors and sash, and window shades for barracks, offices, and quarters; and for flooring and framing for tents, \$2,067,558.60: *Provided*, That no part of the moneys so appropriated shall be paid for commutation of fuel or quarters to officers or enlisted men: *And provided further*, That the number of and total sum paid for civilian employees in the

Quartermaster Corps shall be limited to the actual requirements of the service, and that no employee therein shall receive a salary of more than \$150 per month, except upon the approval of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That of the foregoing appropriation, \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be required, shall be expended to complete the post chapel at Fort Sam Houston.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," on page 46, line 25, after the words "Pacific Oceans," to insert "\$10,734,068.46," and in line 4, after the word "subsistence," to strike out "\$10,516,000" and insert "And *provided further*, That the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stats., 350), entitled 'An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States,' shall hereafter extend to cover loss of or damage to the regulation allowance of baggage of officers and enlisted men sustained in shipment under orders, to the extent of such loss or damage over and above the amount recoverable from the carrier furnishing the transportation," so as to read:

For the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports and other vessels on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, \$10,734,068.46: *Provided further*, That \$75,000 of the appropriation hereby made shall be available for additional pay of employees on harbor boats, quartermaster service, in lieu of subsistence: *And provided further*, That the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stats., 350), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," shall hereafter extend to cover loss of or damage to the regulation allowance of baggage of officers and enlisted men sustained in shipment under orders, to the extent of such loss or damage over and above the amount recoverable from the carrier furnishing the transportation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if that does not change existing law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. A little bit; but I will state to the Senator the reason for it. Many of the officers of the Army own their own mounts, for instance, and their own baggage, and it goes under the Government rates at cheaper rates of transportation; and this is intended to enable them to be paid when their property is lost.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that in the past we have had a good many private claim bills for just such items.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. This is to remedy that.

Mr. SMOOT. This, of course, is making a general law covering them all, and I did not know whether or not it was proper to put it upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that it will cost the Government very little, if any, more to have it put in, and it will avoid the necessity of these private claims coming before this body.

Mr. SMOOT. The only reason why I bring it up is this: Many claims have been made on the part of officers of the Government for property lost such as is provided for in this amendment, and when an examination has been made of the actual cost or value of the article lost we have found that in some cases it is not half the amount claimed in the bill introduced. All I am afraid of is that if this is allowed to be paid by the War Department itself the claims that will be made will be for amounts over the actual value of the property destroyed. I will say to the Senator I know at least of a dozen cases that have been before the Claims Committee, and we have cut them down, after an examination, at least 50 per cent, and it was found that there was full compensation for all the property which was destroyed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Under the rule of the comptroller baggage must now be shipped under the limited valuation at the lower rate, and if you attempt an unlimited valuation it carries a higher rate by 50 per cent, and the full value of the baggage could be collected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the amendment to be agreed to?

Mr. SMOOT. I simply call the attention of the Senate to the fact. If we had time I would discuss it and let it go out and pass the bill. But we have not time at this session. Therefore I will make no point of order against it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 19, after the word "stations," to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$606,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$6,000 of this appropriation may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be used in defraying one-half the cost of paving Thirtieth Street between Fort and Laurel Streets, along the east side of Fort Omaha, in Omaha, Nebr.," so as to make the clause read:

Roads, walks, wharves, and drainage: For the construction and repair by the Quartermaster Corps of roads, walks, and wharves; for the pay of employees; for the disposal of drainage; for dredging channels; and for care and improvement of grounds at military posts

and stations, \$606,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$6,000 of this appropriation may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be used in defraying one-half the cost of paving Thirtieth Street between Fort and Laurel Streets, along the east side of Fort Omaha, in Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if it is customary for the Government to pay for the paving of roads or streets abutting on public buildings or to pave sidewalks outside of military reservations and navy yards.

Mr. DU PONT. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we considered a year or two ago precisely a similar case for a military post in the State of Massachusetts, and it was allowed.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not care a tinker whether it was done in Massachusetts or in Delaware, that is not an answer to my question. I want to know if it is customary to do it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that these claims are unusual for this reason. Nearly all of such places are outside the city limits. In this case, and there are occasionally similar conditions, the city street goes right alongside the reservation. The property owners of the city are compelled to improve to the middle of the street, and there is no way to compel the Government to pay its half.

Mr. WEEKS. Is it the law in Nebraska that the property owner shall pay to the middle of the street?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. To the middle of the street. It is the law in nearly all these cases that the property owners on each side shall pave to the middle of the street. Here we were assured by one of the members of the House committee that this reservation abuts on a street and the property owners on the opposite side are compelled to improve to the middle of the street and there is no way to have the other half improved unless this provision is inserted.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I realize the force of what the Senator from Oregon said, but there is no post-office building in the United States where that is done.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was just going to call attention to that.

Mr. BRISTOW. Why should an exception be made in Omaha? There is not a city in the country that does not pave around the public buildings.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that there is good reason to make an exception in this case.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will examine he will find that in the case of every post-office building in the United States the citizens pay for the paving. I should like to know why a single exception should be made.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to have the Senator name a city where it is done.

Mr. BRISTOW. Salina, Kans., my home town, where I helped to pay for it myself.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. This was brought before the committee and it was held that it was a just claim.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have often thought that the practice was hardly fair on the part of the Government to decline to pay for any portion of the paving; but I have been applied to in the past three years from several cities in Georgia where the paving was laid in front of the Government building, and the request was made that I should seek to have the Government pay one-half of it. I investigated it and I found that it was not the practice. They wanted the Government building and were glad to get it, and I thought the city could afford to pay for the paving.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am not complaining, if it is to be the policy of the Government to pay for paving about Government buildings; but I do not think one community ought to be compelled to pay in one case and the Government pay in another. I think all ought to be treated alike.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we do this, it would seem to me that in each case where there is a public building erected throughout the country we ought to pay one-half of the paving in front of it.

Mr. BRISTOW. I agree with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we ought to understand that we are changing the past policy, and if that is done, of course, we will present from all our States at the next session of Congress bills to pay for half the paving where public buildings have been erected, as the property holders pay for the other half. I just wanted to suggest to the chairman of the committee that while this may have seemed just and appealed to him, I am afraid it would lead to a practice that would involve a much greater expense than this.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am frank to say that when this matter was under consideration the possibility of the Government being called on to pay in other cases did not occur to me

at all. I can see the force of the objection and am willing to leave it to the Senate to dispose of it. I simply submitted it at the instance of a member of the committee in the other House, and on his explanation that the street was to be improved to the middle by the city and the Government should pay the other half.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to say that when this amendment was proposed in the Committee on Military Affairs I was guided more by the precedent that had been established a couple of years ago when we paid for the pavement of a public road or sidewalk near a military post in Massachusetts. It was discussed at the time fully, and the Senate agreed to it without objection. I thought that if we have taken a certain line of conduct in Massachusetts we ought to adopt a similar line of conduct in regard to Omaha, Nebr.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. JONES. I wish to say that I have had a good deal of the same experience the Senator from Georgia has had. When I was a Member of the House I know in several cases the representatives of cities came to me wanting to have provision made to reimburse them or to provide for paving on the side of the public building in the improvement of streets, and I found that it was impossible to get any legislation of that sort. It seems to me if we are going to do anything of this kind it ought to be done under a general law applicable to every locality, and we should not single out one particular place.

I do not know whether this matter is subject to a point of order or not. If it is, I am going to make a point of order. If not, I shall vote against the amendment. I do not know whether any estimate for it has been made or not. I make the point of order that no estimate has been submitted for it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But the committee reported it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Was there an estimate made for this item, the Chair will ask the chairman of the committee?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There was no estimate made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But it has been reported by the committee?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is overruled. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon having the bill in charge if the amendment on page 47, line 20, increasing the appropriation from \$600,000 to \$606,000 should not be reconsidered as the \$6,000 was for paving?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is all one amendment, and it has been disagreed to.

The next amendment was in the appropriation for "Water and sewers at military posts," on page 48, line 16, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$1,564,000" and insert "\$1,673,328.44: *Provided*, That \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the amount appropriated herein shall be immediately available for commencing the project of improving and increasing the water supply at Corregidor Island, P. I." so as to make the clause read:

Water and sewers at military posts: For procuring and introducing water to buildings and premises at such military posts and stations as from their situation require it to be brought from a distance; for the installation and extension of plumbing within buildings where the same is not specifically provided for in other appropriations; for the purchase and repairs of fire apparatus, including fire-alarm systems; for the disposal of sewage, and expenses incident thereto, including the authorized issue of toilet paper; for repairs to water and sewer systems and plumbing within buildings; and for hire of employees, \$1,673,328.44: *Provided*, That \$75,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary of the amount appropriated herein shall be immediately available for commencing the project of improving and increasing the water supply at Corregidor Island, P. I.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Oregon what the estimated cost is of constructing the water supply for this system? I notice the fact that this is for commencing the undertaking, but future appropriations will be necessary. How large are they likely to be?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say that the water supply is totally inadequate to the necessities there, and there has been an estimate made. The hearings before the committee of the Military Affairs of the House shows it as follows:

For improving and increasing the water supply at Corregidor Island by the construction of reservoirs, capacity for 1,000,000 gallons, down-spout connections, cisterns, pipe lines, fittings, etc., to utilize rainfall on that part of the reservation known as "Top Side," \$116,850.

So the amount appropriated is not quite enough, but it is all that they could utilize. The Senator will understand that the only way they can get water there for this purpose will be by catching the rainfall and putting it in down-spout connections, cisterns, and so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the item of appropriation for "Construction, repair, and maintenance, military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska," on page 48, line 25, after "\$125,000," to insert: "*Provided*, That hereafter estimates of appropriations required for the construction, repair, and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails in Alaska shall be submitted by the Board of Road Commissioners constituted by the act approved January 27, 1905, as amended, to the Secretary of War on or before September 1 each year, and after approval by the Secretary of War such estimates shall be embraced in the annual estimates to be submitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury for 'Public works' under the War Department," so as to make the clause read:

Construction, repair, and maintenance, military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska: For the construction, repair, and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Territory of Alaska, \$125,000: *Provided*, That hereafter estimates of appropriations required for the construction, repair, and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails in Alaska shall be submitted by the Board of Road Commissioners constituted by the act approved January 27, 1905, as amended, to the Secretary of War on or before September 1 each year, and after approval by the Secretary of War such estimates shall be embraced in the annual estimates to be submitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury for "Public works" under the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Clothing, and camp and garrison equipage," on page 50, line 23, after the word "reasons," to strike out "\$6,624,000" and insert "\$6,762,000," and on page 51, line 4, after the word "parties," to strike out "with their names at the end thereof," so as to read:

For indemnity to officers and men of the Army for clothing and bedding, etc., destroyed since April 22, 1898, by order of medical officers of the Army for sanitary reasons, \$6,762,000: *Provided*, That hereafter whenever contracts which are not to be performed within 60 days are made on behalf of the Government by the Quartermaster General, or by officers of the Quartermaster Corps authorized to make them, and are in excess of \$500 in amount, such contracts shall be reduced to writing and signed by the contracting parties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for "Shooting galleries and ranges," on page 52, line 19, after the words "Secretary of War," to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$71,000: *Provided*, That \$26,000 thereof may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, for the purchase of a certain tract of land, comprising 280 acres, more or less, being a part of what is known as the Macauley ranch and adjoining the United States Army post at Fort Missoula, in the State of Montana, providing the title to said realty be in fee simple and be approved by the Secretary of War," so as to make the clause read:

Shooting galleries and ranges: For shelter, shooting galleries, ranges for small-arms target practice, repairs, and expenses incident thereto, including flour or paste for marking targets, hire of employees, such ranges and galleries to be open, as far as practicable, to the National Guard and organized rifle clubs under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, \$71,000: *Provided*, That \$26,000 thereof may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, for the purchase of a certain tract of land, comprising 280 acres, more or less, being a part of what is known as the Macauley ranch and adjoining the United States Army post at Fort Missoula, in the State of Montana, providing the title to said realty be in fee simple and be approved by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 4, to insert: Relief of Lieut. Sloan Doak, United States Army: For payment of \$150 to Lieut. Sloan Doak, Fifth United States Cavalry, being the value of his private mount lost in a fire at Fort Riley, Kans., on March 23, 1914, \$150.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 9, to insert: Relief of Lieut. J. A. Barry, United States Army: For payment of \$135 to Lieut. J. A. Barry, Second United States Cavalry, being the value of his private horse lost in a fire at Fort Riley, Kans., on March 23, 1914, \$135.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 14, to insert: Relief of Lieut. Waldo C. Potter, United States Army: For payment of \$375 to Lieut. Waldo C. Potter, First Field Artillery, being the value of his two private horses lost in a fire at Fort Riley, Kans., on March 23, 1914, \$375.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 20, to insert: Relief of Lieut. J. F. Taulbee, United States Army: For payment of \$200 to Lieut. J. F. Taulbee, Second United States Cavalry, the value of his private horse lost in a fire at Fort Riley, Kans., on March 23, 1914, \$200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 55, to insert: Medical services and hospital care rendered George Vay, injured seaman: For payment of \$47.90 to St. Francis Hospital, Newport News, Va., and \$56 to Dr. S. W. Hobson, Newport News, Va., for care and medical services, respectively rendered George Vay, seaman, who, on

February 12, 1913, was seriously injured while in line of duty upon the Army transport *Meade*, then being prepared for active service at Newport News, Va., \$103.90.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 9, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Capt. David L. Stone, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. David L. Stone the sum of \$1,191 disallowed on voucher 6 B of his money accounts for the month of December, 1911, and now standing against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, after line 16, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Capt. Henry L. Kinnison, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. Henry L. Kinnison, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, the sum of \$82.50 disallowed on voucher 12 B of his money accounts for May, 1912, and 6 B of his money accounts for June, 1912, and now standing against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 56, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Lieut. Col. John M. Carson, jr., United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Lieut. Col. J. M. Carson, jr., Deputy Quartermaster General United States Army (now colonel, Quartermaster Corps), the sum of \$1,975 disallowed on vouchers 7 A and 8 A of his money accounts for the month of May, 1909, and now standing against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 10, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Maj. John E. Baxter, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Maj. John E. Baxter, Quartermaster, United States Army (now lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), the sum of \$18.96 disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 17, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Capt. L. C. Brown, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. L. C. Brown, United States Army (now major, Coast Artillery Corps, United States Army), the sum of \$124 suspended against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 57, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Maj. H. L. Pettus, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Maj. H. L. Pettus, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, the sum of \$1,545 disallowed on voucher 11B, January, 1912, and now standing against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 7, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Col. Frederick G. Hodgson (retired), Capt. Briant H. Wells, and Capt. Girard Sturtevant, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of the following-named officers of the Army the sums set opposite their names, respectively, which have been disallowed and charged against them on the books of the Treasury: Col. Frederick G. Hodgson (retired), February, 1912, \$21; Capt. Briant H. Wells, September and October, 1911, \$171; Capt. Girard Sturtevant, December, 1911, \$2.99.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 20, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Maj. James E. Normoyle, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Maj. James E. Normoyle in the sum of \$5 disallowed on voucher 238B of his money accounts for the month of September, 1912, and now standing against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 4, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Maj. G. G. Bailey, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Maj. G. G. Bailey, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, the sum of \$106, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 10, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Lieut. Col. I. W. Littell, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Lieut. Col. I. W. Littell (now colonel, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army) the sum of \$98.05, disallowed on voucher 24 B of his money accounts for September, 1909, and now standing against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 19, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Capt. O. R. Wolfe, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. Orrin R. Wolfe, United States Army, the sum of \$40, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 59, to insert:

Relief of Ethel Fredrickson and daughter Ethel: That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Ethel Fredrickson and daughter Ethel, of San Antonio, Tex., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500, in full settlement of their claim against the Government of the United States for damages done to their property and personal injuries sustained through being run down in the streets of San Antonio, Tex., by a section of Battery B, United States Artillery, from Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, after line 10, to insert:

Relief of Lena Garagon: That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Lena Garagon, of San Antonio, Tex., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,500, in full settlement of her claim against the Government of the United States for damages done to her property and personal injuries sustained through being run down in the streets of San Antonio, Tex., by a section of Battery B, United States Artillery, from Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Medical Department," on page 61, line 7, after the word "Department," to insert "\$750,000: *Provided*, That hereafter, with the approval of the Secretary of War and at rates of charge of not less than the contract prices paid therefor plus 25 per cent to cover the cost of purchase, inspection, etc., the Medical Department of the Army may sell for cash to the American National Red Cross such medical supplies and equipments as can be spared without detriment to the military service"; and in line 23, after the word "concerned," to strike out "\$750,000," so as to read:

For supplies for use in teaching the art of cooking to the Hospital Corps; for the supply of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; for advertising, laundry, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, \$750,000: *Provided*, That hereafter, with the approval of the Secretary of War and at rates of charge of not less than the contract prices paid therefor plus 25 per cent to cover the cost of purchase, inspection, etc., the Medical Department of the Army may sell for cash to the American National Red Cross such medical supplies and equipments as can be spared without detriment to the military service: *Provided further*, That hereafter in the settlement of accounts between the appropriations of the Medical Department and those of any other branch of the Army service, or any bureau or office of the War Department, or any other executive department or establishment of the Government, payment thereof may be made by the proper disbursing officer of the Medical Department or of the branch of the Army service, office, bureau, department, or establishment concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 23, to insert:

Hospital care, Canal Zone garrisons: For paying the Panama Canal such reasonable charges, exclusive of subsistence, as may be approved by the Secretary of War for caring in its hospitals for officers, enlisted men, military prisoners, and civilian employees of the Army admitted thereto upon the request of proper military authority: *Provided*, That the subsistence of the said patients, except commissioned officers and acting dental surgeons, shall be paid to said hospitals out of the appropriation for subsistence of the Army at the rates provided therein for commutation of rations for enlisted patients in general hospitals, \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Engineer Department," on page 65, line 1, after the words "for same," to insert "\$48,000," and in line 5, after the words "motor cycles," to strike out "\$48,000," so as to make the clause read:

Engineer equipment of troops: For pontoon material, tools, instruments, supplies, and appliances required for use in the engineer equipment of troops for military surveys, and for Engineer operations in the field, including the purchase and preparation of Engineer manuals and procurement of special paper for same, \$48,000: *Provided*, That authority is granted for the expenditure from this appropriation of the sum of \$750 for the purchase of two motor cycles, and of the sum of \$200 for the maintenance and repair (exclusive of fuel) of four motor cycles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 9, after the word "commanders," to strike out "\$28,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

Civilian assistants to Engineer officers: For services of surveyors, survey parties, draftsmen, photographers, master laborers, and clerks to Engineer officers on the staffs of division, corps, and department commanders, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Ordnance Department," on page 66, line 12, before the word "horse-drawn," to strike out "motor-propelled or," and in line 13, after the word "vehicles," to insert "and maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle," so as to make the clause read:

Ordnance service: For the current expenses of the Ordnance Department, in connection with purchasing, receiving, storing, and issuing ordnance and ordnance stores, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, and advertising, stationery, typewriters, and adding machines, including their exchange, and office furniture, tools, and instruments of service; for incidental expenses of the Ordnance service and those attending practical trial and tests of ordnance, small arms, and other ordnance stores; for publications for libraries of the

Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance office; subscriptions to periodicals which may be paid for in advance, and payment for mechanical labor in the office of the Chief of Ordnance; and for purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, \$325,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 1, after the word "homes," to insert "\$100,000," and in line 3, after the word "ammunition," to strike out "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

Ordnance stores—ammunition: Manufacture of ammunition for small arms for reserve supply, ammunition for burials at the National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., ammunition for firing the morning and evening gun at military posts prescribed by General Orders No. 70, Headquarters of the Army, dated July 23, 1887, and at National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several branches, including National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., and soldiers' and sailors' State homes, \$100,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$5,000 of this appropriation may be used in the purchase of ammunition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 20, after the word "armories," to insert "\$250,000," and in line 23, after the words "carried out," to strike out "\$250,000," so as to make the clause read:

Manufacture of arms: For manufacturing, repairing, and issuing arms at the national armories, \$250,000: *Provided*, That existing written agreements involving the purchase of patented articles patents for which have not expired may be carried out.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, after line 5, to strike out:

For the purchase and manufacture of armored motor cars, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, after line 7, to insert:

For testing types of armored motor cars, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 10, before the word "manufacturing," to insert "purchasing or"; and in the same line, after the word "manufacturing," to strike out "in Government establishments," so as to read:

Field artillery for Organized Militia: For the purpose of purchasing or manufacturing field artillery material for the Organized Militia of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, without cost to the said States, Territories, or the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 4, before the word "manufacturing," to insert "purchasing or," so as to make the clause read:

Ammunition for Field Artillery for Organized Militia: For the purpose of purchasing or manufacturing reserve ammunition for Field Artillery for the Organized Militia of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, the funds to be immediately available and to remain available until the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, \$2,900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 10, after the words "more than," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

Provided, That not more than \$100,000 of this appropriation may be used in the purchase of Field Artillery reserve ammunition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 12, to strike out:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made, with a stop watch or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this bill be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no claim for services performed by any person while violating this proviso shall be allowed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it seems to me that the House provision, which is proposed to be stricken out by the committee, is a very reasonable one, and I am very sorry that the issue is raised by the amendment proposed by the committee. I notice that there was a report made upon this identical proposition by a committee of the Senate on July 17, 1912, being a favorable report upon a bill which, in substance, was the same as the provision which is here proposed to be stricken out.

Of course the object of using a stop watch or of giving a bonus for extra production by employees is to increase the efficiency and the economy of the Government factories. In that connection, as to whether or not any such system as that—

which, I think, inevitably leads to abuses in driving men beyond their ability in their work—is necessary in the Government factories, it is very interesting to note the cost of the product of Government factories under the system which is now there in vogue as compared with the private factories which are their competitors, in some of which the stop watch and bonus system is used. I only want to call attention to a few items.

I have here, in the report to which I have just referred, some testimony of Gen. Crozier as to the comparative cost of the articles produced in Government factories under the system obtaining there now with those produced in private factories. For instance, 3-inch rifles—that is, field guns—which cost \$2,510.00 in the Rock Island factory, cost \$3,398.82, or an increase of 35.4 per cent in private factories. Caissons, which cost \$1,128.67 in the Rock Island factory, cost \$1,744.10, or 54.6 per cent increase, in private factories. Springfield rifles manufactured in the Springfield Armory, as Gen. Crozier says, at a most liberal estimate, cost the Government not above \$17.65. He adds:

And if it were possible to obtain the opinion of an expert, I would be glad to ask him if he thought the Springfield rifle could be produced by anybody else anywhere and purchased for \$25. My own opinion is that you could not get it as low as \$25 from any manufacturer.

Limbers for 3-inch rifles, which cost \$1,518 when the Government buys them from a private concern, are manufactured for \$684 by the Government itself under the labor system which now obtains. Three-inch caissons, which cost \$1,708 when bought from manufacturing concerns, are manufactured at Rock Island Arsenal for \$1,081. For the 3-inch gun carriages proper, the average of the contract price paid by the Government to private concerns is \$3,268, and the average cost under manufacturing orders at the arsenal is \$2,341; and he states that that includes the overhead charges.

I will not cite any more figures, but those are ample to show, to say the least, that the work is conducted economically and efficiently in the Government factories at the present time.

I notice, Mr. President, that the system of rules and regulations for labor in the Rock Island and other Government factories contain reasonable, and more or less stringent, regulations as to efficiency and as to production, which evidently—judging by the results which I have just cited and many others which I have not cited, for instance, the production of shells for 3-inch guns, which cost \$15 in the Rock Island factory and \$25 in the private factory—demonstrates that any such system as that which is proposed to be prohibited by the provision in the House bill is unnecessary. One of these rules is:

Ability: The ability of an employee will be judged by the quantity and quality of work performed, proper deductions having been made for all errors or deficiencies which may have occurred during the semi-annual period. If for lack of ability employees are employed upon work usually assigned to a lower class, the marking should be correspondingly low, although the work itself may be exceedingly good. Likewise, if employees are employed upon work usually assigned to a higher class, credit should be given therefor. The quality of work shall be expressed by the terms "Excellent," "Very good," "Good," "Fair," and "Poor," the quantity of work by the terms "Very large," "Large," "Average," and "Small." The figures to be attached to these designations are as follows:

Then he gives the figures representing the various grades of quantity and quality of work and as to the habits of employees. One of the rules is:

Habits: In estimating habits, consideration should be given to sobriety, integrity, subordination, cheerful and zealous obedience to orders and regulations. Frequent tardiness and drunkenness on duty will be made the subject of special inquiry. A deduction of 10 points for every absence after Sundays, holidays, or pay days for each day or part of day without having previously obtained leave therefor will be made, and a deduction of 10 points will be made for tardiness in getting to work after reporting.

Reasonable and sensible regulations and rules of that kind seem to produce very excellent results, and I was very much in hope, as otherwise it may occasion a great deal of debate, that the provision which the committee has moved to strike out would be left in the bill and that the amendment reported by the committee would be defeated.

Mr. OLIVER and Mr. HUGHES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the workings of what is called the "stop-watch system," but I have been requested by a committee representing over 400 employees of the Frankford Arsenal, who are now working under what is known as the bonus system, to enter a protest in their behalf against any change looking to the abolition of that system. I have here a communication at some length from them, giving their reasons why the system as applied in that arsenal should not be interfered with. I will say that no stop-watch system is employed at the Frankford Arsenal.

Mr. ROOT. Why not have the communication read?

Mr. OLIVER. Very well, I will ask the Secretary to read the communication. It is signed by a committee consisting of George S. Matthews, Anna E. Armstrong, Charles E. Flynn, Mary Macdonald, and Florence H. Smith, evidently three women and two men. After the communication is read I will read other communications in connection with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Secretary reading the letter submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE FRANKFORD ARSENAL ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 6, 1915.

Hon. GEORGE T. OLIVER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We appreciate very much the effective work which you have accomplished in behalf of the Frankford Arsenal employees in succeeding in inducing the Senate Committee on Military Affairs to strike out the objectionable clause known as the Deitrich bill from the Army bill.

You have asked us to furnish you with more complete information in regard to the bonus system at the Frankford Arsenal, and this we gladly do to the best of our ability:

1. The bonus or premium system was introduced at the Frankford Arsenal about five years ago after a conference between ourselves and the commanding officer at the arsenal. The greater number of the bonus or premium rates was then established, and they remained in operation up to the recent suspension without any change whatever on the part of the management of the arsenal except in our interest. We were assured by the commanding officer that the premium rates then established, or to be established, would be permanent so long as the manufacturing processes and the ammunition manufactured remain the same, and this agreement has never been deviated from by the management except with our consent.

2. The premium or bonus system at the Frankford Arsenal consists in giving the employees a bonus above their daily rates if they make the tasks assigned to them, and if they make in addition anything above the task a premium is also paid, which is usually 50 per cent of the rate at which the bonus was established. For example: If an employee receiving \$2 per day is turning out, say, 200 to 225 pieces daily the management may say to him, "If you will turn out 300 pieces we will give you \$3 for the work; but if you turn out 299 pieces you will only get \$2," which he would get even if he turned out 150 pieces. Furthermore, if he should turn out 400 pieces he would receive \$3 for the 300 pieces and 50 cents for the 100 pieces above the 300, and if he turned out 500 pieces he would receive \$4, etc. In other words, the Government shares in the premium earned by the employee which, it is understood, is due to the fact that the Government furnishes heat, light, power, repairs to machinery, working tools, etc., on which the employee is engaged.

3. The lowest day rate for a male employee at the Frankford Arsenal is \$1.76 per day, but by giving him a bonus for the task assigned him and the premium for what he may do above the task such an employee may earn between \$2.20 and \$2.60 per day. A higher grade workman earning \$2.24 per day on a day rate may earn between \$3 and \$3.20 per day when operating under the bonus and premium system. Men whose day rates are \$3 to \$3.25 per day may earn from \$3.50 to \$4 per day, and over \$4 per day has been earned in case of men whose day rates are as stated.

The lowest day rate paid young women at the arsenal is \$1.16 per day, and such employees have a task assigned to them which enables them to earn \$1.40 per day, and their actual earnings have been as high as \$2.50 per day, but the average earnings of such employees are about \$1.73 per day. Young women whose day rate is \$1.20 per day are able to earn as inspectors between \$2.20 and \$2.26 per day, and there is a case of one young woman who has earned as high as \$3 per day.

4. The committee most emphatically inform you that the earnings referred to have been made by the skill, application, and industry of the employees whom we represent. We most emphatically deny that we have been driven or speeded up or worked beyond our capacity. Not a single employee operating under the premium system, although it has been in force for about five years, has been obliged to give up his or her position due to operating under such a system owing to any physical breakdown. We do say, however, that we apply ourselves to our work and waste no time about the shops. This committee represents about 450 employees engaged in the manufacture of small-arms ammunition under the bonus or premium system, and we know that we are telling you the truth when we make this statement.

5. We understand that the bonus and premium earned by us annually amounts to about \$45,000, and we are confident in stating that in case of other departments at the arsenal there is probably an additional premium or bonus paid to the employees to the extent of at least \$6,000 annually. It may be stated, therefore, that the sum of \$51,000 at least is paid annually by the Government for the increased efficient service which we give to it, and we appreciate such acknowledgment of the service that we render.

6. Based on our increased earnings under the system referred to many of us have taken on obligations by way of purchasing homes or investing our savings in building and loan associations, and we feel that if we are deprived of the opportunity to make such earnings we may lose our homes or other investments on which we have made partial payments.

7. We are perfectly satisfied with our conditions at the arsenal. We particularly like the eight hours of employment, as those of us who are women employees are able to do our sewing when we get home and help our mothers and sisters with the household work. Those of us who are men employees are able, particularly in summer, to work in the gardens about our homes and take our children out for recreation, for Philadelphia is peculiarly a city of homes and gardens, particularly in Frankford.

8. We are provided at the arsenal, in the cartridge factory, with sanitary working conditions, and those of us who are women are provided with chairs at our machines and benches. We have, therefore, no complaint to make of our rates of compensation or of our working conditions except that we would like a retiring room or rest room in each building where we could retire during lunch hours. We hope that Congress will some day furnish such a building.

9. We respectfully invite your attention to the marked benefits that the Government receives, particularly in the manufacture of small-arms ammunition, from the introduction of the bonus or premium system.

We have been informed that for the quantity of small-arms ammunition manufactured last year the costs at the arsenal were such that when they were compared with the latest contract prices for the same ammunition the Government effected a saving of about \$680,000. When such a magnificent showing is made for the Government by the employees whom we represent we ask you, therefore, why should the Government want to change such a system that makes for efficiency and economy, and particularly when those employees operating under it desire no change whatever? We ask you to have the extent of these savings confirmed by reference to the War Department.

10. We read a great deal in the newspapers how much the President and the administration are concerned toward increasing the economy and efficiency of the public service, and we notice that the Saturday Evening Post, a Philadelphia newspaper, has an article by ex-President Taft on the economy and efficiency of the public service. We sincerely believe that we are giving to the President of the United States the very economy and efficiency so much talked about for several years, and since we are perfectly satisfied with the compensation paid us and our working conditions, except as noted above, we simply do not understand why the Government should desire to abolish by law a situation which is so manifestly efficient and satisfactory.

Respectfully submitted,

MARY MACDONALD,
FLORENCE H. SMITH,
GEORGE S. MATTHEWS,
ANNA E. ARMSTRONG,
CHARLES E. FLYNN,

Committee.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, it has been alleged that this system interferes with the health of the employees, that it makes old men of young men, and so on. I have another letter here, which states:

To-day one of the committee, Mr. G. S. Matthews, took Dr. H. A. P. Neel, the attending physician at the arsenal, through the various shops where men and women are employed on the premium rate and where they are not so employed, and no intimation was given to Dr. Neel as to where the premium workers were employed and where those who were not premium workers were employed. The doctor was asked to make this inspection to see if he had noticed in the brief inspection whether or not there was any physical breakdown of the employees at this arsenal. The report of Dr. Neel is inclosed, and you will note that everywhere he found the men and women employees in good physical condition, irrespective of whether they were on premium, piecework, or daywork. The doctor did not know when he made this report where the premium workers were employed.

I have a communication here from Dr. Neel, which I will read:

3602 DISSTON STREET,
Tacony, Philadelphia, February 8, 1915.

Mr. G. S. MATTHEWS,
Frankford Arsenal.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: At your request I made a brief inspection of the various shops at the Frankford Arsenal, accompanied by yourself, the object being to ascertain by a brief inspection whether or not any of the employees working under the premium system showed the effects of overexertion or what you call "speeding up." I visited the cartridge factory, the fuse shop, the primer shop, and the artillery assembling shop, and I found everywhere that the men and women employed were in good physical condition.

In this connection I might state that many of them are patients of mine, and I know that the physical condition of the employees of the Frankford Arsenal is very good. I understand that the premium workers are employed in certain parts of the arsenal, of which I had no knowledge, and therefore my opinion applies to all the employees.

Respectfully,

H. A. P. NEEL, M. D.

Mr. President, the situation of the Frankford Arsenal is about as follows: This premium system has been established. That is, each employee gets a stipulated day's wages. The minimum for women, I believe, is \$1.16 a day, and from that up; and for men the minimum is \$1.75 a day, and from that up. They get their day's wages under any circumstances. There is a certain stipulated task which every machine ought to yield. If the machine yields more than the stipulated task during the eight hours of work, a bonus is paid, so that some of the men whose daily wages are \$1.75 earn up to approximately \$3 a day.

It is represented to me that these employees own homes, have taken stock in building and loan associations, and have undertaken various responsibilities and liabilities based upon this system, and that if this amendment is adopted they will all be put down to the dead level of a day's wages. They will not be able to obtain these premiums to which they have been accustomed and to which they think they have a right, and for Congress now to step in and abolish the system without any further investigation they think is doing them a grave injustice.

It seems to me that any system which seeks to put the industrious, efficient workman down to the level of the lowest, instead of trying to raise the lowest up to the level of the highest and most efficient and most skillful, is all wrong. It is undeniable that this system, as introduced into this particular arsenal—and I have nothing to say about any other—has not only resulted in cheapening the cost of the articles turned out to the Government from that arsenal, but it has resulted in making the employees of the arsenal more contented, better satisfied, and better off in every way.

You can do what you please with the stop-watch system. I do not know what it is. I have never examined it. But any law or

any system that will prevent the officers of the United States Government from placing a premium upon industry and efficiency is wrong, in my opinion; and whoever votes for it will be voting against the interests of the country and against the real and true interests of the working people.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask unanimous consent to have this matter go over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I have no objection to that. There are two or three Senators who desire to speak on it, though not at great length. I will suggest that we might finish the balance of the bill and let that item go over.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I wish to say that if it goes over I desire to say a few words on the subject of this amendment in support of the position of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I want to find out just the position of the Senator from Washington with reference to the matter. Is there any motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is no motion. The matter is still pending on the proposed amendment of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. I wanted to make a motion which would result in letting the House action stand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That result can be accomplished by disagreeing to the amendment. Is this amendment to be passed over?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought, at the request of some of the Senators, that we might complete the balance of the bill and let that one item go over until to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 71, line 6, after the words "per day," to insert "in lieu of subsistence," so as to make the clause read:

Provided, That the appropriations hereinbefore made under the heading "Ordnance Department" shall be available for the payment of an allowance not to exceed \$4 per day in lieu of subsistence to civilian employees of the Ordnance Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 9, to insert:

Provided, That hereafter when one bureau or executive department procures by purchase or manufacture stores or material of any kind or performs any service for another bureau or executive department the funds of the bureau or department for which the stores or material are to be procured or the service performed may be placed subject to the requisition of the bureau or department making the procurement or performing the service for direct expenditure by it: *Provided*, That when the stores being procured are for current issue during the year stores of equal value may be issued from stock on hand in place of any of those aforesaid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 20, to insert:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, any brigadier general of the Army on the retired list who has held the rank and command of major general of Volunteers and performed the duties incident to that grade in time of actual warfare, and has been honorably discharged, and who served with credit in the Regular or Volunteer forces during the Civil War prior to April 9, 1865, to the grade of major general in the United States Army and place him on the retired list with the pay of brigadier general on the retired list; and any officer now on the retired list of the Army who served with credit for more than two years as a commissioned officer of Volunteers during the Civil War prior to April 9, 1865, and who subsequently served with credit for more than 40 years as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army, including service in command of troops in five Indian campaigns, the War with Spain, and the Philippine insurrection, and to whom the congressional medal of honor for most distinguished conduct in action has been twice awarded, and who has also been brevetted for conspicuous gallantry in action, and place him on the retired list of the Army with the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by him at the time of his retirement from active service in the Regular Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 20, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 2. That section 1342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1342. The articles included in this section shall be known as the Articles of War, and shall, at all times and in all places, govern the Armies of the United States, including all persons belonging thereto, and all persons now or hereafter made subject to military law.

"I. PRELIMINARY PROVISIONS.

"ARTICLE 1. Definitions.—The following words when used in these articles shall be construed in the sense indicated in this article, unless the context shows that a different sense is intended, namely:

"(a) The word 'officer' shall be construed to refer to a commissioned officer;

"(b) The word 'soldier' shall be construed as including a noncommissioned officer, a private, or any other enlisted man;

"(c) The word 'company' shall be understood as including a troop or battery; and

"(d) The word 'battalion' shall be understood as including a squadron.

"ART. 2. Persons subject to military law.—The following persons are subject to these articles and shall be understood as included in the term 'any person subject to military law,' or 'persons subject to military law,' whenever used in these articles:

"(a) All officers and soldiers belonging to the Armies of the United States, including Regulars, militia called into the service of the United States from the date of notice of such call, and Volunteers;

"(b) Cadets, veterinarians of Cavalry and Field Artillery, and pay clerks of the Quartermaster Corps;

"(c) Officers and soldiers of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Armies of the United States by order of the President;

"(d) All retainers to the camp and all persons accompanying or serving with the Armies of the United States without the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and in time of war all such retainers and persons accompanying or serving with the Armies of the United States in the field, both within and without the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, though not otherwise subject to these articles;

"(e) All persons under sentence adjudged by courts-martial; and

"(f) All persons now or hereafter declared by law to constitute a part of or to belong to the Armies of the United States or to be subject to the Articles of War or to trial by courts-martial.

"II. COURTS-MARTIAL.

"ART. 3. Courts-martial classified.—Courts-martial shall be of three kinds, namely:

"First. General courts-martial;

"Second. Special courts-martial; and

"Third. Summary courts-martial.

"A. COMPOSITION.

"ART. 4. Who may serve on courts-martial.—Officers of the Regular Army, of the militia when called into the service of the United States, of the Volunteer Army, and of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President shall be competent to serve on courts-martial for the trial of any person who may lawfully be brought before such courts for trial.

"ART. 5. General courts-martial.—General courts-martial may consist of any number of officers from 5 to 13, inclusive.

"ART. 6. Special courts-martial.—Special courts-martial may consist of any number of officers from 3 to 5, inclusive.

"ART. 7. Summary courts-martial.—A summary court-martial shall consist of one officer.

"B. BY WHOM APPOINTED.

"ART. 8. General courts-martial.—The President of the United States, the commanding officer of a territorial division or department, the Superintendent of the Military Academy, the commanding officer of an army, a field army, an army corps, a division, or a separate brigade, and, when empowered by the President, the commanding officer of any district or of any force or body of troops may appoint general courts-martial; but when any such commander is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried the court shall be appointed by superior competent authority, and no officer shall be eligible to sit as a member of such court when he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution.

"ART. 9. Special courts-martial.—The commanding officer of a district, garrison, fort, camp, or other place where troops are on duty, and the commanding officer of a brigade, regiment, detached battalion, or other detached command may appoint special courts-martial; but such special courts-martial may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable, and no officer shall be eligible to sit as a member of such court when he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution.

"ART. 10. Summary courts-martial.—The commanding officer of a garrison, fort, camp, or other place where troops are on duty, and the commanding officer of a regiment, detached battalion, detached company, or other detachment may appoint summary courts-martial; but such summary courts-martial may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable: *Provided*, That when but one officer is present with a command he shall be the summary court-martial of that command and shall hear and determine cases brought before him.

"ART. 11. Appointment of judge advocate.—For each general or special court-martial the authority appointing the court shall appoint a judge advocate, and for each general court-martial one or more assistant judge advocates when necessary.

"C. JURISDICTION.

"ART. 12. General courts-martial.—General courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense made punishable by these articles and any other person who by statute or by the law of war is subject to trial by military tribunal: *Provided*, That no officer shall be brought to trial before a general court-martial appointed by the Superintendent of the Military Academy.

"ART. 13. Special courts-martial.—Special courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law, except an officer, for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided*, That the President may by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, except from the jurisdiction of special courts-martial any class or classes of persons subject to military law.

"Special courts-martial shall not have power to adjudge confinement in excess of six months, nor to adjudge the forfeiture of more than six months' pay.

"ART. 14. Summary courts-martial.—Summary courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law, except an officer, a cadet, or a soldier holding the privileges of a certificate of eligibility to promotion, for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided*, That noncommissioned officers shall not, if they object thereto, be brought to trial before a summary court-martial without the authority of the officer competent to bring them to trial before a general court-martial: *And provided further*, That the President may by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, except from the jurisdiction of summary courts-martial any class or classes of persons subject to military law.

"Summary courts-martial shall not have power to adjudge confinement in excess of three months, nor to adjudge the forfeiture of more than three months' pay: *Provided*, That when the summary court officer is also the commanding officer no sentence of such summary court-martial adjudging confinement at hard labor or forfeiture of pay, or both, for a period in excess of one month shall be carried into execution until the same shall have been approved by superior authority.

"ART. 15. Not exclusive.—The provisions of these articles conferring jurisdiction upon courts-martial shall not be construed as depriving military commissions, provost courts, or other military tribunals of concurrent jurisdiction in respect of offenders or offenses

that by statute or by the law of war may be triable by such military commissions, provost courts, or other military tribunals.

"ART. 16. Officers, how triable.—Officers shall be tried only by general courts-martial, and no officer shall, when it can be avoided, be tried by officers inferior to him in rank.

"D. PROCEDURE.

"ART. 17. Judge advocate to prosecute.—The judge advocate of a general or special court-martial shall prosecute in the name of the United States, and shall, under the direction of the court, prepare the record of its proceedings; but should the accused be unrepresented by counsel, the judge advocate shall from time to time throughout the proceedings advise the accused of his legal rights.

"ART. 18. Challenges.—Members of a general or special court-martial may be challenged by the accused and by the judge advocate, but only for cause stated to the court. The court shall determine the relevancy and validity thereof, and shall not receive a challenge to more than one member at a time.

"ART. 19. Oath of members and judge advocates.—The judge advocate of a general or special court-martial shall administer to the members of the court, before they proceed upon any trial, the following oath or affirmation: 'You, A. B., do swear (or affirm) that you will well and truly try and determine, according to the evidence, the matter now before you, between the United States of America and the person to be tried, and that you will duly administer justice, without partiality, favor, or affection, according to the provisions of the rules and articles for the government of the Armies of the United States, and if any doubt should arise, not explained by said articles, then according to your conscience, the best of your understanding, and the custom of war in like cases; and you do further swear (or affirm) that you will not divulge the findings or sentence of the court until they shall be published by the proper authority, except to the judge advocate and assistant judge advocate; neither will you disclose or discover the vote or opinion of any particular member of the court-martial, unless required to give evidence thereof as a witness by a court of justice in due course of law. So help you God.'

"When the oath or affirmation has been administered to the members of a general or special court-martial, the president of the court shall administer to the judge advocate and to each assistant judge advocate, if any, an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'You, A. B., do swear (or affirm) that you will not divulge the findings or sentence of the court to any but the proper authority until they shall be duly disclosed by the same. So help you God.'

"In case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration will be omitted.

"ART. 20. Continuances.—A court-martial shall, for reasonable cause, grant a continuance to either party for such time and as often as may appear to be just.

"ART. 21. Refusal to plead.—When the accused, arraigned before a court-martial, from obstinacy and deliberate design stands mute or answers foreign to the purpose, the court may proceed to trial and judgment as if he had pleaded not guilty.

"ART. 22. Process to obtain witnesses.—Every judge advocate of a general or special court-martial and every summary court-martial shall have power to issue the like process to compel witnesses to appear and testify which courts of the United States, having criminal jurisdiction, may lawfully issue; but such process shall run to any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

"ART. 23. Oath of witnesses.—All persons who give evidence before a court-martial shall be examined on oath or affirmation in the following form: 'You swear (or affirm) that the evidence you shall give in the case now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help you God.'

"In the case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration will be omitted.

"ART. 24. Refusal to appear or testify.—Every person not subject to military law who, being duly subpoenaed to appear as a witness before any military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before such court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, willfully neglects or refuses to appear, or refuses to qualify as a witness, or to testify, or produce documentary evidence which such person may have been legally subpoenaed to produce, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, for which such person shall be punished on information in the district court of the United States or in a court of original criminal jurisdiction in any of the Territorial possessions of the United States, jurisdiction being hereby conferred upon such courts for such purpose; and it shall be the duty of the United States district attorney or the officer prosecuting for the Government in any such court of original criminal jurisdiction, on the certification of the facts to him by the military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, to file an information against and prosecute the person so offending, and the punishment of such person on conviction shall be a fine of not more than \$500, or imprisonment not to exceed six months, or both, at the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That the fees of such witness and his mileage, at the rates allowed to witnesses attending the courts of the United States, shall be duly paid or tendered said witness, such amounts to be paid out of the appropriation for the compensation of witnesses.

"ART. 25. Compulsory self-incrimination prohibited.—No witness before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to answer any questions which may tend to incriminate or degrade him.

"ART. 26. Depositions.—When admissible.—A duly authenticated deposition, taken upon reasonable notice to the opposite party, may be read in evidence before any military court or commission in any case not capital, or in any proceeding before a court of inquiry or a military board, if such deposition be taken when the witness resides, is found, or is about to go beyond the State, Territory, or district in which the court, commission, or board is ordered to sit, or beyond the distance of 100 miles from the place of trial or hearing, or when it appears to the satisfaction of the court, commission, board, or appointing authority that the witness, by reason of age, sickness, bodily infirmity, imprisonment, or other reasonable cause, is unable to appear and testify in person at the place of trial or hearing: *Provided*, That testimony by deposition may be adduced for the defense in capital cases.

"ART. 27. Depositions.—Before whom taken.—Depositions to be read in evidence before military courts, commissions, courts of inquiry, or military boards, or for other use in military administration, may be taken before and authenticated by any officer, military or civil, author-

ized by the laws of the United States or by the laws of the place where the deposition is taken to administer oaths.

"ART. 28. Courts of inquiry.—Records of, when admissible.—The record of the proceedings of a court of inquiry may be read in evidence before any court-martial or military commission in any case not capital nor extending to the dismissal of an officer, and may also be read in evidence in any proceeding before a court of inquiry or a military board: *Provided*, That such evidence may be adduced by the defense in capital cases or cases extending to the dismissal of an officer.

"ART. 29. Resignation without acceptance does not release officer.—Any officer who, having tendered his resignation and, prior to due notice of the acceptance of the same, quits his post or proper duties without leave and with intent to absent himself permanently therefrom shall be deemed a deserter.

"ART. 30. Enlistment without discharge.—Any soldier who quits the organization to which he properly belongs and, without having first received a regular discharge from such organization, enlists in or joins any other organization of the Army, or militia when in the service of the United States, or the Navy or Marine Corps of the United States, shall be deemed to have deserted the service of the United States and to have fraudulently enlisted.

"ART. 31. Oath of reporters and interpreters.—Every reporter of the proceedings of a court-martial shall, before entering upon his duties, make oath or affirmation in the following form: 'You swear (or affirm) that you will faithfully perform the duties of reporter to this court. So help you God.'

"And every interpreter in the trial of any case before a court-martial shall, before entering upon his duties, make oath or affirmation in the following form: 'You swear (or affirm) that you will truly interpret in the case now in hearing. So help you God.'

"In case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration will be omitted.

"ART. 32. Closed sessions.—Whenever a general or special court-martial shall sit in closed session, the judge advocate, and the assistant judge advocate, if any, shall withdraw; and when their legal advice, or their assistance in referring to the recorded evidence, is required, it shall be obtained in open court.

"ART. 33. Order of voting.—Members of a general or special court-martial, in giving their votes, shall begin with the junior in rank.

"ART. 34. Contempts.—A court-martial may punish, at discretion, subject to the limitations contained in article 14, any person who uses any menacing words, signs, or gestures in its presence, or who disturbs its proceedings by any riot or disorder.

"ART. 35. Records.—General courts-martial.—Each general court-martial shall keep a separate record of its proceedings in the trial of each case brought before it, and such record shall be authenticated by the signature of the president and the judge advocate; but in case the record can not be authenticated by the judge advocate, by reason of his death, disability, or absence, it shall be signed by the president and an assistant judge advocate, if any; and if there be no assistant judge advocate, or in case of his death, disability, or absence, then by the president and one other member of the court.

"ART. 36. Records.—Special and summary courts-martial.—Each special court-martial and each summary court-martial shall keep a record of its proceedings, separate for each case, which record shall contain such matter and be authenticated in such manner as may be required by regulations which the President may from time to time prescribe.

"ART. 37. Disposition of records.—General courts-martial.—The judge advocate of each general court-martial shall, with such expedition as circumstances may permit, forward to the appointing authority, or to his successor in command, the original record of the proceedings of such court in the trial of each case. All records of such proceedings shall, after having been finally acted upon, be transmitted to the Judge Advocate General of the Army.

"ART. 38. Disposition of records.—Special and summary courts-martial.—After having been acted upon by the officer appointing the court, or by the officer commanding for the time being, the record of each trial by special or summary court-martial shall be transmitted to such general headquarters as the President may designate in regulations, there to be filed in the office of the judge advocate. When no longer of use, such records may be destroyed.

"ART. 39. President may prescribe rules.—The President may by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, prescribe the procedure, including modes of proof, in cases before courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and other military tribunals: *Provided*, That nothing contrary to or inconsistent with these articles shall be so prescribed: *And provided further*, That all rules made in pursuance of this article shall be laid before the Congress as soon as practicable after they are made.

"ART. 40. Irregularities.—Effect of.—The proceedings of a court-martial shall not be held invalid nor the findings or sentence disapproved in any case on the ground of improper admission or rejection of evidence or for any error as to any matter of pleading or procedure unless in the opinion of the reviewing or confirming authority, after an examination of the entire proceedings, it shall appear that the error complained of has injuriously affected the substantial rights of an accused: *Provided*, That the act or omission upon which the accused has been tried constitutes an offense denounced and made punishable by one or more of these articles: *And provided further*, That the omission of the words 'hard labor' in any sentence of a court-martial adjudging imprisonment or confinement shall not be construed as depriving the authorities executing such sentence of imprisonment or confinement of the power to require hard labor as a part of the punishment in any case where it is authorized by the executive order prescribing maximum punishments.

"E. LIMITATIONS UPON PROSECUTIONS.

"ART. 41. As to time.—Except for desertion committed in time of war, or for murder, or for rape, no person shall be liable to be tried by a court-martial for any crime or offense committed more than three years before the beginning of the prosecution of such person for such crime or offense: *Provided*, That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused may not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid period of three years: *And provided further*, That the prosecution shall be held to have been begun when the charges shall have been duly received at the headquarters of an authority competent to appoint a court-martial for the trial of charges alleging the commission of the crime or offense in question.

"ART. 42. As to number.—No person shall be tried a second time for the same offense.

"F. PUNISHMENTS.

"ART. 43. Certain kinds prohibited.—Punishment by flogging or by branding, marking, or tattooing on the body is prohibited.

"ART. 44. Penitentiary sentences.—When lawful.—No person shall, under sentence of a court-martial, be punished by confinement in a penitentiary unless the crime or offense of which he may be convicted would, under some statute of the United States or under some law of the State, Territory, District, or other jurisdiction in which the crime or offense may be committed, render such person liable to confinement in a penitentiary; but when a sentence of confinement is adjudged by a court-martial upon conviction of two or more acts or omissions, any one of which, under the statute or other law hereinbefore mentioned, constitutes or includes a crime or offense punishable by confinement in a penitentiary, the entire sentence of confinement imposed by the court-martial may be executed in a penitentiary.

"ART. 45. Death sentences.—When lawful.—No person shall, by general court-martial, be convicted of an offense for which the death penalty is made mandatory by law, nor sentenced to suffer death, except by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present, and for an offense in these articles expressly made punishable by death. All other convictions and sentences, whether by general or special court-martial, may be determined by a majority of the members present.

"ART. 46. Cowardice—Fraud—Accessory penalty.—When an officer is dismissed from the service for cowardice or fraud, the crime, punishment, name, and place of abode of the delinquent shall be published in the newspapers in and about the camp and in the State from which the offender came or where he usually resides; and after such publication it shall be scandalous for an officer to associate with him.

"ART. 47. Maximum limits.—Whenever the punishment for a crime or offense made punishable by these articles is left to the discretion of the court-martial, the punishment shall not, in time of peace, exceed such limit or limits as the President may from time to time prescribe.

"G. ACTION BY APPOINTING OR SUPERIOR AUTHORITY.

"ART. 48. Approval and execution of sentences.—No sentence of a court-martial shall be carried into execution until the same shall have been approved by the officer appointing the court or by the officer commanding for the time being.

"ART. 49. Powers incident to power to approve.—The power to approve the sentence of a court-martial shall be held to include, *inter alia*:

"(a) The power to approve or disapprove a finding, and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense when, in the opinion of the authority having power to approve, the evidence of record requires a finding of only the lesser degree of guilt;

"(b) The power to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence; and

"(c) The power to change the sequence in which a sentence as adjudged by the court may require the execution of the punishments of dishonorable discharge and confinement.

"ART. 50. Confirmation.—When required.—In addition to the approval required by article 48, confirmation by the President is required in the following cases before the sentence of a court-martial is carried into execution, namely:

"(a) Any sentence respecting a general officer;

"(b) Any sentence extending to the dismissal of an officer, except that in time of war a sentence extending to the dismissal of an officer below the grade of brigadier general may be carried into execution upon confirmation by the commanding general of the army in the field or by the commanding general of the territorial department or division;

"(c) Any sentence extending to the suspension or dismissal of a cadet; and

"(d) Any sentence of death, except in the cases of persons convicted in time of war of murder, rape, mutiny, desertion, or as spies; and in such excepted cases a sentence of death may be carried into execution upon confirmation by the commanding general of the army in the field or by the commanding general of the territorial department or division.

"When the authority competent to confirm the sentence has already acted as the approving authority no additional confirmation by him is necessary.

"ART. 51. Powers incident to power to confirm.—The power to confirm the sentence of a court-martial shall be held to include, *inter alia*:

"(a) The power to confirm or disapprove a finding and to confirm so much only of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense when, in the opinion of the authority having power to confirm, the evidence of record requires a finding of only the lesser degree of guilt; and

"(b) The power to confirm or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence.

"ART. 52. Mitigation or remission of sentences.—The power to order the execution of the sentence adjudged by a court-martial shall be held to include, *inter alia*, the power to mitigate or remit the whole or any part of the sentence; but no sentence of dismissal of an officer and no sentence of death shall be mitigated or remitted by any authority inferior to the President.

"Any unexecuted portion of a sentence adjudged by a court-martial may be mitigated or remitted by the authority competent to appoint, for the command in which the person under sentence is held, a court of the kind that imposed the sentence, and the same power may be exercised by superior authority; but no sentence extending to the dismissal of an officer or loss of files, no sentence of death, and no sentence approved or confirmed by the President shall be remitted or mitigated by any other authority.

"The power of remission and mitigation shall extend to all uncollected forfeitures adjudged by sentence of a court-martial.

"ART. 53. Suspension of sentences of dismissal or death.—The authority competent to order the execution of a sentence of dismissal of an officer or a sentence of death may suspend such sentence until the pleasure of the President be known; and in case of such suspension a copy of the order of suspension, together with a copy of the record of trial, shall immediately be transmitted to the President.

"ART. 54. Suspension of sentence of dishonorable discharge.—The authority competent to order the execution of a sentence including dishonorable discharge may suspend the execution of the dishonorable discharge until the soldier's release from confinement; but the order of suspension may be vacated at any time and the execution of the dishonorable discharge directed by the officer having general court-martial jurisdiction over the command in which the soldier is held, or by the Secretary of War.

"ART. 55. Suspension of sentences of forfeiture or confinement.—The authority competent to order the execution of a sentence adjudged by a court-martial may, if the sentence involve neither dismissal nor dishonorable discharge, suspend the execution of the sentence in so far as it relates to the forfeiture of pay, or to confinement, or to both; and the person under sentence may be restored to duty during the suspension of confinement. At any time within one year after the date of the order of suspension such order may, for sufficient cause, be vacated and the execution of the sentence directed by the authority competent to order the execution of like sentences in the command to which the person under sentence belongs or in which he may be found; but if the order of suspension be not vacated within one year after the date thereof the suspended sentence shall be held to have been remitted.

"III. PUNITIVE ARTICLES.

"A. ENLISTMENT; MUSTER; RETURNS.

"ART. 56. Fraudulent enlistment.—Any person who shall procure himself to be enlisted in the military service of the United States by means of willful misrepresentation or concealment as to his qualifications for enlistment, and shall receive pay or allowances under such enlistment, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 57. Officer making unlawful enlistment.—Any officer who knowingly enlists or musters into the military service any person whose enlistment or muster in is prohibited by law, regulations, or orders shall be dismissed from the service or suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 58. False muster.—Any officer who knowingly makes a false muster of man or animal, or who signs or directs or allows the signing of any muster roll, knowing the same to contain a false muster or false statement as to the absence or pay of an officer or soldier; or who wrongfully takes money or other consideration on mustering in a regiment, company, or other organization, or on signing muster rolls; or who knowingly musters as an officer or soldier a person who is not such officer or soldier, shall be dismissed from the service and suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 59. False returns.—Omission to render returns.—Every officer whose duty it is to render to the War Department or other superior authority a return of the state of the troops under his command, or of the arms, ammunition, clothing, funds, or other property thereunto belonging, who knowingly makes a false return thereof, shall be dismissed the service and suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct. And any officer who, through neglect or design, omits to render such return shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"B. DESERTION: ABSENCE WITHOUT LEAVE.

"ART. 60. Desertion.—Any person subject to military law who deserts or attempts to desert the service of the United States shall, if the offense be committed in time of war, suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct, and if the offense be committed at any other time, any punishment, excepting death, that a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 61. Advising or aiding another to desert.—Any person subject to military law who advises or persuades or knowingly assists another to desert the service of the United States shall, if the offense be committed in time of war, suffer death, or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct, and in any other case any punishment, except death, that a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 62. Entertaining a deserter.—Any officer who, after having discovered that a soldier in his command is a deserter from the military or naval service or from the Marine Corps, retains such deserter in his command without informing superior authority or the commander of the organization to which the deserter belongs, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 63. Absence without leave.—Any person subject to military law who fails to repair at the fixed time to the properly appointed place of duty, or goes from the same without proper leave, or absents himself from his command, guard, quarters, station, or camp without proper leave, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"C. DISRESPECT; INSUBORDINATION; MUTINY.

"ART. 64. Disrespect toward the President, Vice President, Congress, Secretary of War.—Any officer who uses contemptuous or disrespectful words against the President, Vice President, the Congress of the United States, or the Secretary of War shall be dismissed from the service or suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct. Any soldier who so offends shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 65. Disrespect toward superior officer.—Any person subject to military law who behaves himself with disrespect toward his superior officer shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 66. Assaulting or willfully disobeying superior officer.—Any person subject to military law who, on any pretense whatsoever, strikes his superior officer, or draws or lifts up any weapon, or offers any violence against him, being in the execution of his office, or willfully disobeys any lawful command of his superior officer, shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 67. Insubordinate conduct toward noncommissioned officer.—Any soldier who strikes or assaults, or attempts or threatens to strike or assault, or willfully disobeys the lawful order of a noncommissioned officer while in the execution of his office, or uses threatening or insulting language, or behaves in an insubordinate or disrespectful manner toward a noncommissioned officer while in the execution of his office, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 68. Mutiny or sedition.—Any person subject to military law who attempts to create or who begins, excites, causes, or joins in any mutiny or sedition in any company, party, post, camp, detachment, guard, or other command, shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 69. Failure to suppress mutiny or sedition.—Any officer or soldier who, being present at any mutiny or sedition, does not use his utmost endeavor to suppress the same, or knowing or having reason to believe that a mutiny or sedition is to take place does not, without delay, give information thereof to his commanding officer, shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 70. Quarrels; frays; disorders.—All officers and noncommissioned officers have power to part and quell all quarrels, frays, and disorders among persons subject to military law, and to order officers who take part in the same into arrest, and other persons subject to military law who take part in the same into arrest or confinement, as circumstances may require, until their proper superior officer is acquainted therewith. And whosoever, being so ordered, refuses to obey such officer or noncommissioned officer, or draws a weapon upon or otherwise threatens or does violence to him, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"D. ARREST; CONFINEMENT.

"ART. 71. Arrest or confinement of accused persons.—An officer charged with crime or with a serious offense under these articles shall be placed in arrest by the commanding officer, and in exceptional cases an officer so charged may be placed in confinement by the same authority. A soldier charged with crime or with a serious offense under these articles shall be placed in confinement, and when charged with a minor offense he may be placed in arrest. Any other person subject to military law charged with crime or with a serious offense under these articles shall be placed in confinement or in arrest, as circumstances may require; and when charged with a minor offense such person may be placed in arrest. Any person placed in arrest under the provisions of this article shall thereby be restricted to his barracks, quarters, or tent, unless such limits shall be enlarged by proper authority. Any officer who breaks his arrest or who escapes from confinement before he is set at liberty by proper authority shall be dismissed from the service or suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct; and any other person subject to military law who escapes from confinement or who breaks his arrest before he is set at liberty by proper authority shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 72. Investigation of and action upon charges.—The charge against any person placed in arrest or confinement shall be investigated promptly by the commanding officer or other proper military authority, and immediate steps shall be taken to try and punish the person accused or to dismiss the charges against him and release him from arrest or confinement. In every case where a person remains in military custody for more than five days without being served with charges upon which he is to be tried a special report of the necessity for the delay shall be made by his commanding officer in the manner prescribed by regulations, and a similar report shall be forwarded every five days thereafter until charges are served or until such person is released from custody; and if the person remains in military custody for more than 30 days without being brought before a court-martial for trial, the authority responsible for bringing him to trial shall render to superior authority a special report of the necessity for the delay. Any officer whose duty it is to make such investigation or to take such steps or to render such report who willfully or negligently fails to do so promptly, and any officer who is responsible for unreasonable or unnecessary delay in carrying the case to a final conclusion, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct: *Provided*, That in time of peace no person shall, against his objection, be brought to trial before a general court-martial within a period of five days subsequent to the service of charges upon him.

"ART. 73. Refusal to receive and keep prisoners.—No provost marshal or commander of a guard shall refuse to receive or keep any prisoner committed to his charge by an officer belonging to the forces of the United States, provided the officer committing shall, at the time, deliver an account in writing, signed by himself, of the crime or offense charged against the prisoner. Any officer or soldier so refusing shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 74. Report of prisoners received.—Every commander of a guard to whose charge a prisoner is committed shall, within 24 hours after such confinement, or as soon as he is relieved from his guard, report in writing to the commanding officer the name of such prisoner, the offense charged against him, and the name of the officer committing him; and if he fails to make such report he shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 75. Releasing prisoner without proper authority.—Any person subject to military law who, without proper authority, releases any prisoner duly committed to his charge, or who through neglect or design suffers any prisoner so committed to escape, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 76. Delivery of offenders to civil authorities.—When any person subject to military law, except one who is held by the military authorities to answer for a crime or offense punishable under these articles, is accused of a crime or offense committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia, and punishable by the laws of the land, the commanding officer is required, except in time of war, upon application duly made, to use his utmost endeavor to deliver over such accused person to the civil authorities, or to aid the officers of justice in apprehending and securing him, in order that he may be brought to trial. Any commanding officer who upon such application refuses or willfully neglects, except in time of war, to deliver over such accused person to the civil authorities or to aid the officers of justice in apprehending and securing him shall be dismissed from the service or suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"When, under the provisions of this article, delivery is made to the civil authorities of an offender undergoing sentence of a court-martial, such delivery, if followed by conviction, shall be held to interrupt the execution of the sentence of the court-martial, and the offender shall be returned to military custody, after having answered to the civil authorities for his offense, for the completion of the said court-martial sentence.

"E. WAR OFFENSES.

"ART. 77. Misbehavior before the enemy.—Any officer or soldier who misbehaves himself before the enemy, runs away, or shamefully abandons or delivers up any fort, post, camp, guard, or other command which it is his duty to defend, or speaks words inducing others to do the like, or casts away his arms or ammunition, or quits his post or colors to plunder or pillage, or by any means whatsoever occasions false alarms in camp, garrison, or quarters, shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 78. Subordinates compelling commander to surrender.—If any commander of any garrison, fort, post, camp, guard, or other command is compelled by the officers or soldiers under his command, to give it up to the enemy or to abandon it, the officers or soldiers so offending shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 79. Improper use of countersign.—Any person subject to military law who makes known the parole or countersign to any person not entitled to receive it according to the rules and discipline of war, or gives a parole or countersign different from that which he received, shall, if the offense be committed in time of war, suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 80. Forcing a safeguard.—Any person subject to military law who, in time of war, forces a safeguard shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 81. Captured property to be secured for public service.—All public property taken from the enemy is the property of the United States and shall be secured for the service of the United States, and any person subject to military law who neglects to secure such property or is guilty of wrongful appropriation thereof shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 82. Dealing in captured or abandoned property.—Any person subject to military law who buys, sells, trades, or in any way deals in or disposes of captured or abandoned property, whereby he shall receive or expect any profit, benefit, or advantage to himself or to any other person directly or indirectly connected with himself, or who falls whenever such property comes into his possession or custody or within his control to give notice thereof to the proper authority and to turn over such property to the proper authority without delay, shall on conviction thereof be punished by fine or imprisonment, or by such other punishment as a court-martial, military commission, or other military tribunal may adjudge, or by any or all of said penalties.

"ART. 83. Introducing goods into enemy territory.—Any person who takes or causes to be taken into enemy territory, or to any other point to be thence taken into enemy territory; or

"Who transports or sells or otherwise disposes of therein any goods, wares, or merchandise whatsoever, except in pursuance of license and authority of the President as by law provided; or

"Who makes any false statement or representation upon which such license or authority is granted for such transportation, sale, or other disposition; or

"Who under any license or authority willfully or knowingly transports, sells, or otherwise disposes of any other goods, wares, or merchandise than such as are in good faith so licensed and authorized; or

"Who willfully or knowingly transports, sells, or disposes of the same or any portion thereof in violation of the terms of such license or authority, or in violation of any rule or regulation prescribed concerning the same; or

"Who keeps false accounts or makes false returns respecting operations under such license or authority,

"Shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine or imprisonment, or by such other punishment as a court-martial, military commission, or other military tribunal may adjudge, or by any or all of said penalties.

"ART. 84. Relieving, corresponding with, or aiding the enemy.—Whoever relieves the enemy with arms, ammunition, supplies, money, or other thing, or knowingly harbors or protects or holds correspondence with or gives intelligence to the enemy, either directly or indirectly, shall suffer death, or such other punishment as a court-martial or military commission may direct.

"ART. 85. Spies.—Any person who in time of war shall be found lurking or acting as a spy in or about any of the fortifications, posts, quarters, or encampments of any of the armies of the United States or elsewhere shall be tried by a general court-martial or by a military commission, and shall, on conviction thereof, suffer death.

"F. MISCELLANEOUS CRIMES AND OFFENSES.

"ART. 86. Military property.—Willful or negligent loss, damage, or wrongful disposition of.—Any person subject to military law, who willfully or through neglect, suffers to be lost, spoiled, damaged, or wrongfully disposed of any military property belonging to the United States shall make good the loss or damage and suffer such punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 87. Waste or unlawful disposition of military property issued to soldiers.—Any soldier who sells or wrongfully disposes of or willfully or through neglect injures or loses his horse, arms, ammunition, accouterments, equipment, clothing, or other property issued for use in the military service shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 88. Drunk on duty.—Any officer who is found drunk on duty shall, if the offense be committed in time of war, be dismissed from the service and suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct; and if the offense be committed in time of peace, he shall be punished as a court-martial may direct. Any person subject to military law, except an officer, who is found drunk on duty shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 89. Misbehavior of sentinel.—Any sentinel who is found drunk or sleeping upon his post, or who leaves it before he is regularly relieved, shall, if the offense be committed in time of war, suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct; and if the offense be committed in time of peace he shall suffer any punishment, except death, that a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 90. Personal interest in sale of provisions: Any officer commanding in any garrison, fort, barracks, camp, or other place where troops of the United States may be serving who, for his private advantage, lays any duty or imposition upon or is interested in the sale of any victuals or other necessities of life brought into such garrison, fort, barracks, camp, or other place for the use of the troops, shall be dismissed from the service and suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 91. Intimidation of persons bringing provisions: Any person subject to military law who abuses, intimidates, does violence to, or wrongfully interferes with any person bringing provisions, supplies, or other necessities to the camp, garrison, or quarters of the forces of the United States shall suffer such punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 92. Good order to be maintained and wrongs redressed: All persons subject to military law are to behave themselves orderly in quarters, garrison, camp, and on the march; and any person subject to military law who commits any waste or spoil, or willfully destroys any property whatsoever (unless by order of his commanding officer), or commits any kind of depredation or riot, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct. And any commanding officer who, upon complaint made to him, refuses or omits to see reparation made to the party injured, in so far as the offender's pay shall go toward such reparation, shall be dismissed from the service, or otherwise punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 93. Provoking speeches or gestures: No person subject to military law shall use any reproachful or provoking speeches or gestures to another; and any person subject to military law who offends against the provisions of this article shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 94. Duelling.—Attempts to commit suicide: Any person subject to military law who fights or promotes or is concerned in or connives at fighting a duel, or who having knowledge of a challenge sent or about to be sent, fails to report the fact promptly to the proper authority, or who attempts to commit suicide, shall, if an officer, be dismissed from the service or suffer such other punishment as a court-martial may direct, and if any other person subject to military law, shall suffer such punishment as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 95. Murder—Rape: Any person subject to military law who commits murder or rape shall suffer death or imprisonment for life, as a court-martial may direct; but no person shall be tried by court-martial for murder or rape committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia in time of peace.

"ART. 96. Various crimes: Any person subject to military law who commits manslaughter, mayhem, arson, burglary, robbery, larceny, embezzlement, perjury, assault with intent to commit any felony, or assault with intent to do bodily harm, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

"ART. 97. Frauds against the Government: Any person subject to military law who makes or causes to be made any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"Who presents or causes to be presented to any person in the civil or military service thereof, for approval or payment, any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"Who enters into any agreement or conspiracy to defraud the United States by obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the allowance or payment of any false or fraudulent claim; or

"Who for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, makes or uses, or procures, or advises the making or use of, any writing or other paper, knowing the same to contain any false or fraudulent statement; or

"Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, makes, or procures, or advises the making of, any oath to any fact or to any writing or other paper, knowing such oath to be false; or

"Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, forges or counterfeits, or procures, or advises the forging or counterfeiting, of any signature upon any writing or other paper, or uses, or procures, or advises the use of any such signature, knowing the same to be forged or counterfeited; or

"Who, having charge, possession, custody, or control of any money or other property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, knowingly delivers, or causes to be delivered, to any person having authority to receive the same, any amount thereof less than that for which he receives a certificate or receipt; or

"Who, being authorized to make or deliver any paper certifying the receipt of any property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof, makes or delivers to any person such writing, without having full knowledge of the truth of the statements therein contained and with intent to defraud the United States; or

"Who steals, embezzles, knowingly and willfully misappropriates, applies to his own use or benefit, or wrongfully or knowingly sells or disposes of any ordnance, arms equipments, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, money, or other property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof; or

"Who knowingly purchases or receives in pledge for any obligation or indebtedness from any soldier, officer, or other person who is a part of or employed in said forces or service any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, or other property of the United States, such soldier, officer, or other person not having lawful right to sell or pledge the same;

"Shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine or imprisonment, or by such other punishment as a court-martial may adjudge, or by any or all of said penalties. And if any person, being guilty of any of the offenses aforesaid while in the military service of the United States, receives his discharge or is dismissed from the service, he shall continue to be liable to be arrested and held for trial and sentence by a court-martial in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had not received such discharge nor been dismissed.

"ART. 98. Conduct unbecoming an officer and gentleman.—Any officer or cadet who is convicted of conduct unbecoming an officer and gentleman shall be dismissed from the service.

"ART. 99. General article.—Though not mentioned in these articles, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the military service, and all crimes or offenses not capital, of which persons subject to military law may be guilty, shall be taken cognizance of by a general or special or summary court-martial, according to the nature and degree of the offense and punished at the discretion of such court.

"IV. COURTS OF INQUIRY.

"ART. 100. When and by whom ordered.—A court of inquiry to examine into the nature of any transaction of or accusation or imputation against any officer or soldier may be ordered by the President or by any commanding officer; but a court of inquiry shall not be ordered by any commanding officer except upon the request of the officer or soldier whose conduct is to be inquired of.

"ART. 101. Composition.—A court of inquiry shall consist of three or more officers. For each court of inquiry the authority appointing the court shall appoint a recorder.

"ART. 102. Challenges.—Members of a court of inquiry may be challenged by the party whose conduct is being inquired into and by the recorder, but only for cause stated to the court. The court shall determine the relevancy and validity of any challenge, and shall not receive a challenge to more than one member at a time.

"ART. 103. Oath of members and recorder.—The recorder of a court of inquiry shall administer to the members the following oath: 'You, A. B., do swear (or affirm) that you will well and truly examine and inquire, according to the evidence, into the matter now before you, without partiality, favor, affection, prejudice, or hope of reward. So help you God.' After which the president of the court shall administer to the recorder the following oath: 'You, A. B., do swear (or affirm) that you will, according to your best abilities, accurately and impartially record the proceedings of the court and the evidence to be given in the case in hearing. So help you God.'

"In case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration will be omitted.

"ART. 104. Powers; procedure.—A court of inquiry and the recorder thereof shall have the same power to summon and examine witnesses as is given to courts-martial and the judge advocate thereof. Such witnesses shall take the same oath or affirmation that is taken by witnesses before courts-martial. A reporter or an interpreter for a court of inquiry shall, before entering upon his duties, take the oath or affirmation required of a reporter or an interpreter for a court-martial. The party whose conduct is being inquired into shall be permitted to examine and cross-examine witnesses so as fully to investigate the circumstances in question.

"ART. 105. Opinion on merits of case.—A court of inquiry shall not give an opinion on the merits of the case inquired into unless specially ordered to do so.

"ART. 106. Record of proceedings—How authenticated.—Each court of inquiry shall keep a record of its proceedings, which shall be authenticated

by the signatures of the president and the recorder thereof, and be forwarded to the convening authority. In case the record can not be authenticated by the recorder, by reason of his death, disability, or absence, it shall be signed by the president and by one other member of the court.

"V. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

"ART. 107. Disciplinary powers of commanding officers.—Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, and which he may from time to time revoke, alter, or add to, the commanding officer of any detachment, company, or higher command may, for minor offenses not denied by the accused, impose disciplinary punishments upon soldiers of his command without the intervention of a court-martial. The disciplinary punishments authorized by this article may include admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges, extra fatigue, and restriction to certain specified limits, but shall not include forfeiture of pay or confinement under guard. A soldier punished under authority of this article who deems his punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense, may, through the proper channel, appeal to the next superior authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged. The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, and superior authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment. No soldier shall suffer a disciplinary punishment a second time for the same act or omission. The imposition and enforcement of disciplinary punishment under authority of this article for any act or omission shall not be a bar to trial by court-martial for a crime or offense growing out of the same act or omission; but the fact that a disciplinary punishment has been enforced may be shown by the accused upon trial, and when so shown shall be considered in determining the measure of punishment to be adjudged in the event of a finding of guilty.

"ART. 108. Injuries to persons or property—Redress.—Whenever complaint is made to any commanding officer that damage has been done to the property of any person or that his property has been wrongfully taken by persons subject to military law, such complaint shall be investigated by a board consisting of any number of officers from one to three, which board shall be convened by the commanding officer and shall have, for the purpose of such investigation, power to summon witnesses and examine them upon oath or affirmation, to receive depositions or other documentary evidence, and to assess the damages sustained against the responsible parties. The assessment of damages made by such board shall be subject to the approval of the commanding officer, and in the amount approved by him shall be stopped against the pay of the offenders. And the order of such commanding officer directing stoppages herein authorized shall be conclusive on any disbursing officer for the payment by him to the injured parties of the stoppages so ordered.

"Where the offenders can not be ascertained, but the organization or detachment to which they belong is known, stoppages to the amount of damages inflicted may be made and assessed equally upon the individual members thereof who are shown to have been present with such organization or detachment at the time the damages complained of were inflicted.

"ART. 109. Arrest of deserters by civil officials.—It shall be lawful for any civil officer having authority under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, District, or possession of the United States to arrest offenders, summarily to arrest a deserter from the military service of the United States and deliver him into the custody of the military authorities of the United States.

"ART. 110. Soldiers to make good time lost.—Every soldier who deserts the service of the United States, or who without proper authority absents himself from his organization, station, or duty for more than one day, or who is confined for more than one day under sentence, or while awaiting trial and disposition of his case, if the trial results in conviction, or who through the intemperance use of drugs or alcoholic liquor, or through disease the result of his own misconduct, renders himself unable for more than one day to perform duty shall be liable to serve, after his return to a full-duty status, for such period as shall, with the time he may have served prior to such desertion, unauthorized absence, confinement, or inability to perform duty, amount to the full term of his enlistment.

"ART. 111. Soldiers—Separation from service.—No soldier shall be discharged from the service of the United States without a certificate of discharge in writing signed by an officer having authority, under regulations prescribed by the President, to sign such certificate of discharge; and no certificate of discharge shall be issued to any soldier before the completion of his term of service, except pursuant to the sentence of a general court-martial or by order of the President, of the Secretary of War, or of an officer having authority under regulations prescribed by the President to issue such orders: *Provided*, That no soldier shall, before the completion of his term of service, be discharged by order of the President, of the Secretary of War, or of any officer, unless such discharge be ordered in the interest of the United States or in pursuance of statutes now in force or which may hereafter be enacted.

"ART. 112. Oath of enlistment.—At the time of his enlistment every soldier shall take the following oath or affirmation: 'I, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America; that I will serve them honestly and faithfully against all their enemies whomsoever; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to the Rules and Articles of War.' This oath or affirmation may be taken before any officer.

"ART. 113. Certain articles to be read and explained.—Articles 1, 2, and 30, 56 to 99, inclusive, and 107 to 112, inclusive, shall be read and explained to every soldier at the time of his enlistment or muster in, or within six days thereafter, and shall be read and explained once in every six months to every garrison, regiment, or company in the service of the United States.

"ART. 114. Copy of record of trial.—Every person tried by a general court-martial shall, on demand therefor, made by himself or by any person in his behalf, be entitled to a copy of the record of trial.

"ART. 115. Effects of deceased persons—Disposition of.—In case of the death of any person subject to military law, the commanding officer of the place or command will permit the legal representative or widow or next of kin of the deceased, if present, to take possession of all his effects then in camp or quarters; and if no legal representative or widow or next of kin be present, the commanding officer shall direct a summary court to secure all such effects; and said summary court shall have authority to convert such effects into cash, by public or private sale, to collect and receive any debts due decedent's estate by local debtors, and to pay all necessary expenses and debts due from the estate to local creditors; and as soon as practicable after converting such effects into cash said summary court shall deposit with the proper officer, to be

designated in regulations, any balance in cash belonging to decedent's estate, and shall transmit a receipt for such deposit, accompanied by any will or other papers of value belonging to the deceased, an inventory of the effects secured by said summary court, and a full account of his transactions to the War Department for transmission to the Auditor for the War Department for action as authorized by law in the settlement of the accounts of deceased officers or enlisted men of the Army; but if in the meantime the legal representative, widow, or next of kin shall present himself to take possession of decedent's estate the said summary court shall turn over to him all effects not sold and any balance in cash belonging to said estate, together with an inventory and account, and make to the War Department a full report of his transactions.

"The provisions of this article shall be applicable to inmates of the United States Soldiers' Home who die in any United States military hospital outside of the District of Columbia where sent from the home for treatment.

"ART. 116. Inquests.—Whenever at any post, fort, camp, or other place garrisoned by the military forces of the United States and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, any person shall have been found dead under circumstances which appear to require investigation, the commanding officer will designate and direct a summary court-martial to investigate the circumstances attending the death; and, for this purpose, such summary court-martial shall have power to summon witnesses and examine them upon oath or affirmation. He shall promptly transmit to the post or other commander a report of his investigation and of his finding as to the cause of the death.

"ART. 117. Authority to administer oaths.—Any judge advocate or acting judge advocate, the president of a general or special court-martial, any summary court-martial, the judge advocate or any assistant judge advocate of a general or special court-martial, the president or the recorder of a court of inquiry or of a military board, any officer designated to take a deposition, any officer detailed to conduct an investigation, and the adjutant of any command, shall have power to administer oaths for the purposes of the administration of military justice and for other purposes of military administration.

"ART. 118. Appointment of reporters and interpreters.—Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may from time to time prescribe, the judge advocate of a court-martial or military commission, or the recorder of a court of inquiry, shall have power to appoint a reporter, who shall record the proceedings of and testimony taken before such court or commission, and may set down the same, in the first instance, in shorthand. Under like regulations the judge advocate of a court-martial or military commission, or the recorder of a court of inquiry, may appoint an interpreter who shall interpret for the court or commission.

"ART. 119. Powers of assistant judge advocates.—An assistant judge advocate of a general court-martial shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon the judge advocate of the court.

"ART. 120. Removal of civil suits.—When any civil suit is commenced in any court of a State against any officer, soldier, or other person in the military service of the United States, on account of any act done under color of his office or status, or in respect to which he claims any right, title, or authority under any law of the United States respecting the military forces thereof, or under the law of war, such suit may at any time before the trial or final hearings thereof be removed for trial into the district court of the United States in the district where the same is pending, in the manner prescribed in section 33 of the act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved March 3, 1911, and the cause shall thereupon be entered on the docket of said district court and shall proceed therein as if the cause had been originally commenced in said district court and the same proceedings had been taken in such suit in said district court as shall have been had therein in said State court prior to its removal, and said district court shall have full power to hear and determine said cause.

"ART. 121. Officers—Separation from service.—No officer shall be discharged or dismissed from the service except by order of the President or by sentence of a general court-martial, and in time of peace no officer shall be dismissed except in pursuance of the sentence of a court-martial or in mitigation thereof, nor discharged except in pursuance of statutes now in force or which may hereafter be enacted, but the President may at any time drop from the rolls of the Army any officer who has been absent from duty three months without leave or who has been absent in confinement in a prison or penitentiary for three months after final conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction.

"ART. 122. Rank and precedence among Regulars, militia, and Volunteers.—Officers of the same grade shall rank and have precedence in the following order, without regard to date of rank or commission as between officers of different classes, namely: First, officers of the Regular Army and officers of the Marine Corps detached for service with the Army by order of the President; second, officers of the Organized Militia in the service of the United States; and third, officers of the Volunteer forces: *Provided*, That officers of the Regular Army holding commissions in the Organized Militia in the service of the United States or in the Volunteer forces shall rank and have precedence under said commissions as if they were commissions in the Regular Army, but the rank of officers of the Regular Army under their commissions in the Organized Militia shall not, for the purpose of this article, be held to antedate muster into the service of the United States: *And provided further*, That in time of war or public danger, when two or more officers of the same grade are on duty in the same field, department, or command, or of any organization thereof, the President may assign the command of such field, department, or command, or of any organization thereof, without regard to seniority of rank in the same grade.

"ART. 123. Command when different corps or commands happen to join.—When different corps or commands of the military forces of the United States happen to join or do duty together the officer highest in rank of the line of the Regular Army, Marine Corps, Organized Militia, or Volunteers there on duty shall, subject to the provisions of the preceding article, command the whole and give orders for what is needful in the service, unless otherwise directed by the President."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if this matter which has been gone over so rapidly is really the Articles of War of the Army and the same provisions which have already been acted on by the Senate?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Exactly the same, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Word for word.

Mr. WEEKS. I suppose there has been a board of officers revising the Articles of War.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that a revision of the Articles of War has been insisted upon by nearly every Judge Advocate General of the Army since 1883 and by others high in military circles.

The revision of the Military Code which is here presented was originally transmitted to the respective chairmen of the Military Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives in April of 1912 by the then Secretary of War. The revision was accompanied by a full exposition of all the changes proposed and a statement also of the necessity for the revision. The measure proposed was promptly introduced in both Senate and House and referred to their respective committees on military affairs. Extensive hearings were held by the House Military Committee during May, 1912, and several amendments were suggested by members of that committee during the progress of the hearings, but Congress adjourned without further action.

In January of 1913 the Secretary of War called to Washington all the general officers of the line for a conference on matters of Army organization. He appointed them a board to consider the revision of the Articles of War. That board reported to him, expressing the opinion that the revision which had been proposed to Congress represented a much-needed improvement, and that its enactment would promote the prompt and efficient administration of military justice. Conditions remained adverse, however, to the consideration of the revision as a whole, but the Senate Military Committee, in February of 1913, in response to this urgent letter of the general officers of the line, reported a bill incorporating 10 of the articles of the proposed revision relating to the constitution, composition, and jurisdiction of courts-martial. This bill was promptly passed by the Senate with some amendments, and was subsequently incorporated in the Army appropriation bill, then pending, and enacted into law as a part of that appropriation bill March 2, 1913. Further than this the revision did not receive attention of either House of Congress during the Sixty-second Congress.

Upon the convening of the Sixty-third Congress the then chairman of the Senate Military Committee, the late Senator Johnston, requesting the Secretary of War to transmit to him a new draft of the revision, incorporating the amendments suggested during the House Military Committee's hearing. The Secretary of War complied with this on April 14, 1913, and on the following day Senator Johnston introduced the revision as Senate bill 1032. It was referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and a subcommittee was appointed to consider the revision. I had the honor to be a member of that subcommittee, and we worked assiduously on the articles in conjunction with the Secretary of War, Lindley M. Garrison, the Chief of Staff, and the Judge Advocate General. The bill was reported out of the full committee favorably and passed the Senate on February 9, 1914. The bill here presented to the Senate is identical with the bill which the Senate has already passed, except as to minor changes necessary to conform it to the more recently enacted volunteer law and to correct certain typographical errors appearing in the original Senate draft.

The necessity for revision is beyond any question. Our Military Code, as a code, has not been revised by Congress, except by piecemeal legislation, since 1806. Eighty-seven of the articles of the code of 1806 survive in the present code of 128 articles without change and many others without substantial change. It goes almost without saying that a criminal code which has not undergone comprehensive revision for more than a century needs the attention of Congress.

The necessity for revision was felt as early as 1818, when Gen. Scott brought the matter to the attention of the then Secretary of War, Mr. Calhoun. Standard military law writers, including O'Brien, writing in 1845, and Winthrop, in 1886 and again in 1896, have recommended extensive revision. In 1888 Secretary of War Endicott convened a board of five officers to consider the general subject of revision of the articles of war, and that board submitted a complete revision. It is true, also, that many officers participating in or responsible for the administration of military justice have repeatedly urged the necessity for revision.

Mr. WEEKS. I understand that this is a unanimous report?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Massachusetts that this is a very well-considered and much-needed revision of the articles of war.

Mr. WEEKS. I am simply asking for information. It was gone over so rapidly that I have not had time to examine it, and I wanted to know the process which was used in arriving at the conclusions.

Mr. ROOT. It has been very maturely considered, and is a revision for which there has long been need.

Mr. LODGE. It has passed the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In that connection I desire to have printed in the Record the statements of the different judge advocates general since 1883 in advocacy of this very amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO THE REVISION OF THE RULES AND ARTICLES OF WAR.

Maj. Goodfellow (1883), judge advocate:

"My observation here (judge advocate, department of the Missouri) has confirmed the impression I have received from an experience of some 18 years as a staff judge advocate, after several years' previous service in the line, that the Articles of War need revision and simplification, so as to eliminate much that is obsolete and surplus in their provisions. * * * It seems to me that the enumeration of offenses might be comprehended in two categories, one of capital offenses and one of those less than capital offenses."

Capt. Claus (1883), later Judge Advocate General:

"The rules and Articles of War, in so far as they relate to criminal procedure; the definition of, and punishment for crimes, have not been materially altered since their original enactment in 1776. The defects and omissions found in them have been pointed out, and their revision urged by abler pens than mine, and I simply desire, by my reference to this subject, to add my humble recommendation for reform in this respect."

Maj. Goodfellow (1884), judge advocate:

"I would renew my recommendation, that an effort should be made by the Judge Advocate General's Department to have a revision of the Articles of War, or rather the enactment of a brief code of military penalties in place of that now contained in the present articles. Together with much that is obsolete, the present Articles of War contain much that relates to the military administration generally rather than to crimes and penalties or to regulation of courts-martial. It would be a great convenience if a short code embracing only these matters could be enacted."

Capt. Baldwin (1885), acting judge advocate:

"During the last year there have been developed examples and cases which, to the most casual observer, warrant the oft-repeated recommendation that our entire system and form of administering military justice should undergo a thorough revision."

Maj. Goodfellow (1885), judge advocate:

"The present Articles of War were enacted, in most part, nearly 80 years ago, and it would seem highly desirable that the military criminal code embraced in them should be revised, simplified, and consolidated. Some of the provisions are almost as antiquated as the provision of section 1628, Revised Statutes, in the chapter relating to the militia, requiring that every citizen, after enrollment, shall be constantly provided with two spare flints for his firelock."

Capt. Ballance (1885), Acting Judge Advocate General:

"There are many inconveniences and defects in the laws and regulations governing courts-martial, among which may be mentioned that the present Articles of War might be improved very materially both in diction and arrangement; obsolete portions left out; the parts treating of crimes and penalties, criminal procedure, and mere administrative regulations should, for convenience, be arranged under appropriate headings and articles."

Judge Advocate General Lieber (1885):

"The Articles of War may be divided into three general classes—the first, the penal code, consisting of 54 articles; the second, those of the remaining 74, which are primarily regulations like the eleventh article, which class should be entirely eliminated; and third, those relating to the Constitution and proceedings of courts-martial or, generally, to the administration of justice through the medium of these courts. This latter class are not properly articles of war, or at least form no part of the penal code, and should be grouped separately. By this process the military penal code would be made to stand by itself, and would become easy to grasp and handle. But the Articles of War seem to me to require revision in a more important particular. It has from time to time been deemed necessary to engraft new principles upon them, and I believe it would be well were this carried out somewhat further. As it is not the object in this place to discuss the subject, I shall refer to but four or five points in illustration. (Then follow specific recommendations.)

"But, without going further into this matter, I feel sure that I am not expressing my opinion alone when I say that the whole subject of the revision of the Articles of War is of sufficient importance to justify the appointment of a board of officers for its consideration."

Judge Advocate General Lieber (1886):

"In my last annual report I took occasion to invite attention to a subject which seems to me particularly to demand it. I refer to the revision of the Articles of War. I still remain of the opinion that their revision is very desirable, and therefore would again ask that the matter may be considered. I take the liberty of extracting from the report of 1885 so much as relates to this subject." (Then follows an extract in full of all that was said on the subject in the report of 1885, including general remarks and specific recommendations.)

Gen. Lieber then adds:

"These particular points were dwelt upon simply as illustrations of a general proposition. To go further (in these specific recommendations) would, perhaps, too nearly have approached the appearance of an effort on the part of this office to submit a revision of its own."

"There are those—although I believe comparatively few—who doubt the advisability of undertaking such a work, fearing perhaps that there may be some danger lurking in it or believing that what has sufficed our wants until now would continue to do so. Yet it is certainly true that no code of laws can be devised suited to all the changing circumstances of a growing nation. The code to which we so tenaciously cling is of English origin and intended to be adapted to English wants and institutions, which in important respects differ from our own. There certainly can be no reason for adhering to a collection of words on the ground of antiquity alone. The English themselves have not

done so, having, on the contrary, from time to time engrafted new principles upon their code, thus giving it a new life and satisfying the needs of to-day much better than our own. We have, it is true, made some important additions to our code, but it is very far from being free from faults and beyond improvement."

"The revision of the Articles of War is not, however, a work which can be accomplished in a day, and in the meantime the administration of military justice is apt to be obstructed for want of legislation. To some of the subjects upon which legislation is desirable I have already referred. I shall briefly invite attention to a few more, touching also upon some of the particulars wherein the English military code seems to be in advance of our own."

Secretary of War Endicott (1886):

"I am of the opinion that many of the articles should be changed, and I hope to present to Congress at an early day such changes as may be considered necessary for the present needs of the service. Our present code is of English origin, and we have adhered to it, although the English have made great and essential changes in its provisions."

Judge Advocate General Lieber (1887):

"In the last two annual reports from this office attention was invited to the necessity of revising the Articles of War, so that obsolete and useless matter might be eliminated, the articles be confined to what would properly be a military penal code, a gradation of punishment be adopted, etc. Thoroughly convinced, as I am, of the desirability of such a revision, I take the liberty, at the risk of being considered importunate, to again invite attention to the subject; and I accordingly repeat what I took occasion to say in my last annual report." (Here follows a complete extract of all that was said in the way of general and specific recommendations in the report of 1886, which, it will be remembered, included all that had been said on these subjects in the report of 1885.)

Secretary of War Endicott (1887):

"I would also renew the recommendation * * * for revision of the Articles of War, which have remained substantially unaltered, while in England and elsewhere military codes have been modified in accordance with requirements of modern times. I hope to submit for the consideration of the proper committee of Congress some drafts of enactments dealing with these amendments of the law."

Capt. Ballance, acting judge advocate (1888):

"The necessity of revising the Articles of War is so universally admitted, and attention has been so frequently called to it, that it would seem temerity to again call attention to it."

Col. Barr, judge advocate, later Judge Advocate General (1888):

"The varied questions referred to this office make plain the necessity for legislation upon several vitally interesting subjects. The Articles of War are, in some of their most essential features, vague and indeterminate in their phraseology, while some of them can have no application to our service, having reference solely to the system of administration practiced in the British service from which they were derived. The surplusage of these latter does no harm, but great injury is wrought by the obscurity of the former. The most pressing need of the service is, in my judgment, the adoption of a new code simplifying and making plain all of the present articles essential in their provisions for the government of the Army, and specifying the penalties to be adjudged for clearly defined offenses."

Capt. Ballance, acting judge advocate (1889):

"The necessity for revising the Articles of War has been apparent for years and should be done speedily."

Capt. Bailey, acting judge advocate (1889):

"Many of the Articles of War are mere regulations, having no bearing upon the administration of military justice, and should be eliminated from the code."

Col. Curtis, judge advocate (1889):

"Not a few of our Articles of War need careful revision, for many of them are behind the times."

Adjt. Gen. Kelton (1889):

"One of the most urgent needs of the military service is a revision of the Articles of War that will provide a well-defined penal code (in full accord with modern ideas of justice) for the guidance and government of both courts-martial and commanding officers."

"The present Articles of War are a military anachronism to-day. They, as well as much of what are known as the 'customs of war in like cases' and 'the customs of the service' (the unwritten law of the Army), date back to that time when severe methods were by military men considered absolutely necessary to maintain the kind of discipline they thought the only one to be adapted for the government of bodies of armed men. It seems now desirable to abandon many of the customs of war and of the service handed down to us and adopt those growing out of our own military life and experience."

"The necessity for a revision of the whole military code has long since been presented and several times attempted, but without any results whatever in bringing it in full harmony with modern military sentiments and conditions struggling to find expression and existence in the Army and with the humane laws and enlightened condition of the country. It will be a welcome day for Army administration when the phrase 'customs of war in like cases' is expunged from the oaths of Army courts and judge advocates during times of peace, for surely we should be able in this country to administer military law according to the eternal principles of justice without invoking the aid of the cruel and arbitrary 'customs of war.' Under these 'customs' our military courts habitually impose upon offenders a fine of from \$5 to \$10 when justice would be satisfied with one ranging from 50 cents to \$2. * * * There is far more necessity for limiting by law the power of military courts in peace than that of the judges of our civil courts."

Secretary of War Proctor (1889):

"I recommend the revision of the Articles of War, and that provision be made for the punishment of certain minor offenses, under well-defined restrictions, without the intervention of a court-martial and oftentimes long precedent confinement in a guardhouse."

Capt. Carbaugh, judge advocate (1892):

"In making any remarks or recommendations concerning the administration of military justice one may say that existing practice is not materially defective or ineffectual, though it is quite evident that it does not always conform to existing statutes. This condition is doubtless due to the fact that this administration is being had under 'piecemeal' legislation—made up of Articles of War and isolated statutes relating to subjects included in the articles, a combination which, from a judicial standpoint, appears to be a very imperfect code. A systematic codification of these laws so as to exclude all that is obsolete and contradictory and to include accurate definitions of the powers, obligations, and prohibitions, not only as to individuals but especially as to courts in the military establishment, seems to be necessary."

Capt. Carbaugh, judge advocate (1893):

"The time has come, I believe, for a new codification and reenactment of the Articles of War, whereby, without the use of experimental legislation, military methods in trials and sentence could be improved."

The next amendment was, on page 126, after line 15, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 3. That chapter 6, Title XIV, of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"1. The United States Military Prison, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., shall hereafter be known as the United States Military Detention Barracks.

"2. Persons sentenced to confinement upon conviction by courts-martial or other military tribunals of crimes or offenses which, under some statute of the United States or under some law of the State, Territory, District, or other jurisdiction in which the crime or offense may be committed, are punishable by confinement in a penitentiary, including persons sentenced to confinement upon conviction by courts-martial or other military tribunals of two or more acts or omissions, any one of which, under the statute or other law hereinbefore mentioned, constitutes or includes a crime or offense punishable by confinement in a penitentiary, may be confined at hard labor, during the entire period of confinement so adjudged, in any United States, State, Territorial, or District penitentiary, or in any other penitentiary directly or indirectly under the jurisdiction of the United States; and all persons sentenced to confinement upon conviction by courts-martial or other military tribunals who are not confined in a penitentiary may be confined and detained in the United States Military Detention Barracks.

"3. The government and control of the United States Military Detention Barracks and of all offenders sent thereto for confinement and detention therein shall be vested in the Secretary of War, who shall from time to time make such regulations respecting the same as may be deemed necessary, and who shall submit annually to Congress a full statement of the financial and other affairs of said institution for the preceding fiscal year.

"4. The officers of the United States Military Detention Barracks shall consist of a commandant and such subordinate officers as may be necessary, who shall be detailed by the Secretary of War from the commissioned officers of the Army at large. In addition to detailing for duty at said detention barracks such number of enlisted men of the staff corps and departments as he may deem necessary, the Secretary of War shall assign a sufficient number of enlisted men of the line of the Army for duty as guards at said detention barracks and as noncommissioned officers of the disciplinary organizations hereinafter authorized. Said guards, and also the enlisted men assigned for duty as noncommissioned officers of disciplinary organizations, shall be detached from the line of the Army, or enlisted for the purpose; and said guards shall be organized as infantry, with noncommissioned officers, musicians, artificers, and cooks of the number and grades allowed by law for infantry organizations of like strength: *Provided*, That at least one of said guards shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a battalion sergeant major.

"5. The commandant of the United States Military Detention Barracks shall have command thereof and charge and custody of all offenders sent thereto for confinement and detention therein; shall govern such offenders and cause them to be employed at such labor and in such trades and to perform such duties as may be deemed best for their health and reformation and with a view to their honorable restoration to duty or their reenlistment as hereinafter authorized; shall cause note to be taken and a record to be made of the conduct of such offenders; and may shorten the daily time of hard labor of those who by their obedience, honesty, industry, and general good conduct earn such favors—all under such regulations as the Secretary of War may from time to time prescribe.

"6. The Secretary of War shall provide for placing under military training those offenders sent to the United States Military Detention Barracks for confinement and detention therein whose record and conduct are such as to warrant the belief that upon the completion of a course of military training they may be worthy of an honorable restoration to duty or of being permitted to reenlist; may provide for the organization of offenders so placed under military training into disciplinary companies and higher units, organized as Infantry, with noncommissioned officers, except color sergeants, selected or appointed from the enlisted men assigned to duty for that purpose pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 4 hereof; and may provide for uniforming, arming, and equipping such organizations.

"7. Whenever he shall deem such action merited the Secretary of War may remit the unexecuted portions of the sentences of offenders sent to the United States Military Detention Barracks for confinement and detention therein, and in addition to such remission may grant those who have not been discharged from the Army an honorable restoration to duty, and may authorize the reenlistment of those who have been discharged or upon their written application to that end order their restoration to the Army to complete their respective terms of enlistment, and such application and order of restoration shall be effective to revive the enlistment contract for a period equal to the one not served under said contract.

"8. The Secretary of War may, from time to time, designate any building or structure or any part thereof under the control of the Secretary of War and pertaining to the military establishment as a branch military detention barracks for the confinement and detention of offenders whom it is impracticable to send to the United States Military Detention Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; and all branch military detention barracks and all offenders sent thereto for confinement and detention therein shall be subject to the laws respecting the United States Military Detention Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and the offenders sent thereto for confinement and detention therein."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, after line 20, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 4. That hereafter the provisions of section 26 of the act of February 2, 1901, as modified for the Ordnance Department by section 2 of the act of June 25, 1906, and by the act of March 3, 1909, shall be held to include the Judge Advocate General's Department: *Provided*, That the board of officers which is to recommend officers for detail in the Judge Advocate General's Department shall be composed of officers of that department: *And provided further*, That acting judge advocates may be detailed for tactical brigades, and when not immediately

required for service with geographical departments or tactical divisions or brigades, acting judge advocates may be assigned to such other legal duty as the exigencies of the service may require.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 131, after line 10, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 5. That the following sections of the Revised Statutes and the following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Sections 1202, 1203, and 1326 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) That part of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1877, which reads as follows:

"*Provided, however*, That hereafter the records of regimental, garrison, and field officers and courts-martial shall, after having been acted upon, be retained and filed in the judge advocate's office at the headquarters of the department commander in whose department the courts were held for two years, at the end of which time they may be destroyed."

(c) Section 3 of an act entitled "An act to amend the Articles of War, and for other purposes," approved July 27, 1892.

(d) Sections 1 and 4 of an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to promote the administration of justice in the Army,' approved October 1, 1890, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898.

(e) Section 1 of an act entitled "An act to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1901; and

(f) Section 8 of an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes," approved January 21, 1903, as amended by section 6 of an act entitled "An act to further amend the act entitled 'An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes,' approved January 21, 1903," approved May 27, 1908.

Also all other sections and parts of sections of the Revised Statutes and acts and parts of acts in so far as they are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 133, after line 2, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 6. That all offenses committed and all penalties, forfeitures, fines, or liabilities incurred prior to the taking effect of this act, under any law embraced in or modified, changed, or repealed by this act, may be prosecuted, punished, and enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 133, after line 8, to insert as a new section the following:

Sec. 7. That sections 3 and 4 of this act shall take effect at once; and sections 2, 5, and 6 shall take effect January 1, 1916.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There are a number of small amendments I desire to offer, which I do not think will involve any question. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 12, after the committee amendment in lines 11 to 25, already agreed to, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to detail officers of the Army, active or retired, for duty with the Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, nothing is said there as to whether or not they shall be paid extra compensation. I think it ought to be provided in the amendment that no extra compensation shall be paid to any officer so detailed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that, though they could not be paid extra compensation unless provision were made for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the amendment as read the words "without extra compensation."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I simply wish to ask the chairman of the committee, in case a retired Army officer was detailed to this active duty, whether he ought not to get better pay than when retired.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the law now is that where he is detailed for active duty he gets the regular compensation.

Mr. SMOOT. Up to the pay of a major.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But would not this amendment cut that off?

Mr. SMOOT. It is regulated, then, by the law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is regulated by the statute as it exists.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 13, line 13, after the words "Revised Statutes," I move to insert a comma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, line 13, after the words "Revised Statutes," it is proposed to insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 16 there is an amendment which is rendered necessary by the action of the Senate in striking out the provision in reference to clerks, and I desire to ask that the amendments which I send to the desk may be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$2,250."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. After line 7, it is proposed to insert:

Two chiefs of division, office of the Chief of Staff, at \$2,000 each per annum; one principal clerk, office of the Chief of Staff, at \$2,000 per annum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 8, it is proposed to strike out "15 clerks" and insert "12 clerks."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Following line 17, it is proposed to insert "one chief messenger, office of the Chief of Staff, at \$1,000 per annum."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 18, it is proposed to strike out "two messengers" and insert "one messenger."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 23, it is proposed to strike out "one laborer, at \$480 per annum."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In line 18, the word "each" should be stricken out also. There is only one messenger.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be done, without objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 23, lines 4 and 5, I move to transpose the words "during illness" so as to come after the word "care" in line 6. I will send up the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to transpose the words "during illness" so as to come after the word "care," in line 6, so that, if amended, it will read:

And medical care during illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Now I should like to ask the Senate to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 23, beginning at line 24, and ending on the next page on line 14, was adopted, in order to make one change in the provision.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Now I move to strike out of the amendment as adopted the words, in line 3, page 24, "under 60 years of age."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "under 60 years of age," so that, if amended, it will read:

Provided, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized within two years of the approval of this act, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to transfer to the active list of the Army all officers who may have been transferred heretofore for physical disability.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 25, line 18, I move to strike out the words "nurses (female)" and insert the words "members of the Nurse Corps."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 25, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the words "nurses (female)" and insert the words "members of the Nurse Corps."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 25, line 23, after the word "veterinarians" and the comma, I move to insert the words "members of the Nurse Corps."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 25, line 23, after the word "veterinarians" and the comma, it is proposed to insert "members of the Nurse Corps."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 25, line 25, I move to strike out the words "nurses (female) and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 25, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "nurses (female) and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 26, line 2, I move to strike out the words "nurses and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "nurses and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 26, line 8, of the committee amendment, I move to insert, after the word "veterinarians" and the comma, the words "members of the Nurse Corps."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That went out on a point of order.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That went out; yes. Of course it all went out, then.

Mr. President, this might be treated as new legislation; but I should like to insert in lieu of the amendment which was stricken out because it was new legislation, having reference to commutation of quarters, and so forth, the following:

Provided further, That hereafter heat and light for the authorized allowance of quarters of commissioned officers, acting dental surgeons, veterinarians, pay clerks, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men, when on duty where there are no public quarters available, if commuted, will be commuted at the following rates.

Then it sets out a table of rates to be charged.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I make the same point of order against that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 26, line 16, after the word "this," I move to insert "or any other."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, line 16, after the word "this" and before the word "act," it is proposed to insert "or any other."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 61, line 23, after the word "concerned" and the comma, I move to insert:

Provided further, That hereafter sections 1222 and 1224, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to officers of the Medical Corps of the Army who shall, with the approval of the President, be detailed or authorized to render professional services for or under the local governments of the insular possessions of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The Secretary read the amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That was prepared at the request of Gen. Gorgas as essential to a proper disposition of the service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment in behalf of the only Army officer in the active service who served during the Civil War. It is for his promotion. He has been passed over time after time and others have been promoted over his head. He retires in a few months, and this is to give him the title of brigadier general. It is the case of Col. Clem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 72, after line 20, insert:

That any officer now on the active list of the Army who served not less than 100 days in the Regular or Volunteer forces of the United States during the Civil War and prior to April 9, 1865, who was honorably discharged therefrom, and who shall since have served not less than 40 years as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army, shall, at his own request, be placed on the retired list of the Army, with the rank of major general.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I look with great dissatisfaction upon an amendment of this character. I dislike to see our laws loaded up with provisions containing descriptions of this kind.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I will not be insistent about it, but I have felt ever since I have been upon the Committee on Military Affairs that the service of this gallant little officer should be recognized in this way. I believe he is the only man who served during the Civil War who is now on the active list, and I have felt time and again that not only President Taft, but our own distinguished Executive, ought to have promoted him. Yet they have taken up somebody below him every time and put him at the head of the list. He will be compelled to retire on account of age before the next Congress convenes, and this will simply give him that honor before he dies.

Mr. ROOT. I will not make a point of order on it, Mr. President, but I want to vote against it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. So do I.

Mr. ROOT. I think it is wrong.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following:

Hereafter, for six years from July 1, A. D. 1916, whenever any cadet shall have finished three years of his course at the United States Military Academy, his successor may be admitted to the academy.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment proposes to extend the present law six years longer.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that I have no objection to the amendment; I approve it; but my secretary informs me that it is in the Military Academy appropriation bill, which has just passed the other House.

Mr. LODGE. If it is in the Military Academy appropriation bill, I will withdraw it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to move an amendment, to come in on page 71, after line 9, which I send to the desk. It was introduced some days ago as an amendment to this bill. I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 71, after line 9, insert:

That the President is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to the grade of brigadier general on the retired list one lieutenant colonel, who has served continuously for 30 years, with credit and distinction, as a commissioned officer in the Regular Army, and who also served four years in the Confederate Army, with credit and distinction, and is now the only officer on the rolls of the United States Army who had such Confederate service, said lieutenant colonel being recommended by the Secretary of War for said advancement and commended in the highest terms by distinguished general officers under whom he served at various times, in Indian campaigns, in the War with Spain, and at numerous garrison stations, during his years of active duty, and this course with regard to said lieutenant colonel having received the approval of the Senate in a bill passed by the Senate (S. 784) on the 15th of August last without a dissenting voice.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in explanation of the amendment I wish to make this statement: The Senate on August 11 passed a bill placing Lieut. Col. Junius L. Powell on the retired list with the rank of brigadier general. He served for four years in the Confederate service with honor and he served for 30 years after that in the United States Regular Army with distinction and attained the rank of lieutenant colonel. There were very many things in connection with the case that made it one which appealed to the Senate, and it passed unanimously. I have described his service in such a way that it can not possibly touch anyone except him, and the Senate in passing this amendment to the Army appropriation bill would merely repeat its action in passing the bill itself.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we have just refused by a vote of the Senate to pass such legislation. That being the case, and not desiring a vote, as perhaps there is not a quorum present, I shall feel constrained to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is this distinction between the two cases. The Senate has already passed upon this case and passed upon it favorably and unanimously. It was favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. I am merely attempting to get it on the appropriation bill, so that it will become a law at this session. I am afraid it can not become a law at this session if it has to pass both Houses in a separate bill. I think there is a clear distinction between the two cases.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any question but that it is general legislation on an appropriation bill, and, having just voted

down the other amendment, I feel constrained to make a point of order against it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see how it can be called general legislation very well.

Mr. ROOT. It is brigadier-general legislation, which is the very worst kind. I think we ought to protect ourselves and our committee against the persistent lobbying that goes on here on the part of retired public servants of various kinds to get privilege and advance and increase of compensation by favor of Members of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is seldom that the Senator from New York is facetious in public. Of course he is correct literally in saying it is brigadier-general legislation, or it might be called lieutenant-colonel legislation, the old rank which this man held. But this is the case of a man who served 4 years in one army and then later went into the Federal Army and served 30 years with distinguished mention by the War Department half a dozen times. His case has been passed by this body. It was favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. The legislation was recommended by the War Department. It has everything behind it that deprives it of being a case of special favoritism, as the Senator from New York says. It is a plain case of justice and nothing else.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it estimated for?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not in the general appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order will be sustained on that point.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to add a new paragraph on page 71, after line 9.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 71, after line 9, insert:

That there is hereby donated to the trustees of the Gordon Institute, located at Barnesville, Ga., 10 condemned cannon, the same being ten 12-pound Napoleon guns now located at the United States Arsenal in Augusta, Ga., and being condemned and not fitted for use by the military forces of the United States; also a suitable outfit of cannon balls; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to deliver said 10 Napoleon guns and cannon balls to the trustees of the said Gordon Institute: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred or paid by the United States, and that the Secretary of War shall approve of such donation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Georgia that we have a regular bill on the calendar granting condemned cannon to different States. Would it not be better for him to allow that amendment to come on the regular bill?

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, if the Senator cares particularly I will have to do that, but I hope the Senator will not insist on that course for this reason: I am serving an unexpired term here, and I could not get my proposition in the regular bill, and unless I can get it in this bill there will be no chance at all. There is no objection whatever that I know to it.

Mr. SMOOT. There would be no objection to putting it on the regular bill, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. But I can not get it on that bill now.

Mr. SMOOT. Why so?

Mr. HARDWICK. The regular bill has already been made up.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the regular bill is on the calendar of the Senate.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand that the regular bill is over in the other House, and I did not have a chance to put it in on that bill. That is the reason why I offer the amendment now.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Georgia the bill is on the calendar of the Senate now, but I shall not object to the amendment if the chairman of the committee does not.

Mr. JONES. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that I am afraid he is taking an advantage in this matter. He will be getting 10 of these cannon and we get only 2.

Mr. HARDWICK. Nobody else wants them.

Mr. JONES. Our State wants them, all right.

Mr. FLETCHER. All these cannon are located at the arsenal at Augusta.

Mr. HARDWICK. Nobody else has been applying for them. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WORKS. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 20 on page 11 insert:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to purchase a suitable tract of land on or near the Bay of San Diego, San Diego County, Cal., for an aviation school and training grounds of the Signal Corps of the United States Army.

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of purchasing said tract of land to be used by the Secretary of War, the sum of \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for said purpose, to be available upon such purchase being made.

That there is also appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional sum of \$200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose, for the erection of the

necessary buildings on said tract of land, the same to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and to be available when necessary for that purpose.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, this matter has been before the Committee on Military Affairs in the form of a bill that was introduced by me and was reported favorably, but it is a matter of urgency. For that reason I am asking to have it included in this bill.

In this connection I should like to have read a letter of the Secretary of War on the subject which will explain the situation.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be printed without reading.

Mr. WORKS. No; I want to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 18, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

SIR: The department is in receipt of S. 7046, a bill providing for the purchase of lands for an aviation school near San Diego, Cal.

The necessity of a permanent establishment for the aviation section of the Signal Corps is self-evident. The country in the vicinity of San Diego Bay, San Diego, Cal., owing to atmospheric conditions, varied nature of the terrain, and the presence of a large body of water, is better adapted to the establishment of an aviation school than any other part of the United States.

The school is at present located on North Island, where it is a tenant at will through the courtesy of the Coronado Beach Co., and where, owing to the impracticability of obtaining a lease, it has been undesirable to erect any but the most temporary structures.

The department approves this measure and recommends its enactment into law.

Very respectfully,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I offer the following amendment, increasing the amount for bridges and trails in Alaska. I think the amendment will have the approval of the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 48, line 25, strike out the numerals "\$125,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to read:

Construction, repair, and maintenance, military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska: For the construction, repair, and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails, Territory of Alaska, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 50, at the end of line 2, insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That on and after the passage of this act, no officer, enlisted man of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, or a Civil Service employee, shall be required to serve in a single tour of duty over two years in the Philippine Islands, nor more than three years in the Hawaiian Islands, unless a state of war exists, or a threatened invasion of a foreign enemy.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is subject to a point of order as being legislation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; it is not, Mr. President. I do not want to detain the Senate at this late hour in attempting an explanation of the amendment, except to say that the entire Medical Corps of the Army are agreed that the existing tour of three years in the tropical climate of the Philippine Islands is too much to impose on white men in the Army. They return with ruined constitutions and there is not necessity for it.

I wish to have printed in this connection a brief memorandum in relation to the foreign service, and I ask the chairman of the committee if he can not find it in line of duty to allow it to go to conference to be considered there?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I shall be very glad to have that done. I think the amendment ought to be adopted as a matter of fact.

The amendment was agreed to.

There being no objection, the statement referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personal experience is the best evidence of a fact. During the past 16 years of service in the Philippine Islands there has been untold misery and suffering of the soldier's mind and body, by the reason of the inherited conditions of a tropical country, and the statistics will show that the mortality of the American soldier in the Philippine Islands is a question for grave consideration and action by the War Department. It is beyond challenge of the death lists, permanent diseases, and temporary illness of the men in the service in the Philippine Islands. Conditions have improved, yes; but the distance from home has never lessened to the American soldier. If the War Department wants to be fair and desires to decide the length of tour of service by the records of the Medical Corps, then let the record be spread.

Two years takes this inward spirit of the average man out of him, and when it has been increased to three years the extra year largely reduces the spirit of effectiveness of the man, reduces his condition both in mind and body, and instead of being a fighting machine becomes a

dissatisfied representative of the American Army. It is not all disease of the body in the Philippine Islands, but it is that knowing, every-day thought of going home. Three years adds to the deterioration of 90 per cent of the officers past the age of 50 years and puts back 50 per cent of the energy of the enlisted man's ambition. Officers are holding on in tropical countries by superhuman nerve at the deadly cost of the milepost. Why not leave this length of tour of duty in tropical countries to the officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, who are men of honor, men of thought, men of judgment, and men of duty?

When an officer of unusual health wants to have his tour of duty extended, nominate the tour to suit his strength, not his determination.

Investigate the ages of the officers now on the retired list and enlisted men who have seen service in tropical countries, and compare it to the ages of the officers serving on active duty in foreign wars, and the comparison becomes discreditable to our American born. Check the transports of to-day and yesterday, and note the officers who are going home on forced leave by physical disability due to tropical service. The enlisted men are not reenlisting in the Philippine Islands by reason of the extended tour of duty.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I want to be sure that on page 26 the language in lines 3, 4, and 5 has been stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment was disagreed to, which leaves in the House text.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; that ought to go out. The subsequent part which was stricken out on a point of order was not a supplement of that particular proviso.

Mr. SMOOT. I called the attention of the Chair to it, and the Chair held it was one amendment, and therefore there was no need of a reconsideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was one amendment. Did the Senator want it out?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move to strike it out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, to strike out those lines. The amendment was agreed to.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., Monday, February 22, 1915) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 23, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 22 (legislative day of February 19), 1915.

MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Trade Commission, provided for in the act of Congress approved September 26, 1914:

Joseph E. Davies, of Wisconsin, for a term of seven years.

Edward N. Hurley, of Illinois, for a term of six years.

William J. Harris, of Georgia, for a term of five years.

Will H. Parry, of Washington, for a term of four years.

George Rublee, of New Hampshire, for a term of three years.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22 (legislative day of February 19), 1915.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

CLASS 3.

Rutherford Bingham to be secretary of embassy or legation.
William Penn Cresson to be secretary of embassy or legation.
Jordan Herbert Stabler to be secretary of embassy or legation.
Frederick A. Sterling to be secretary of embassy or legation.

CLASS 4.

Glenn Stewart to be secretary of embassy or legation.

CONSULS GENERAL.

CLASS 2.

William H. Robertson to be consul general.
John H. Snodgrass to be consul general.

CLASS 3.

John P. Bray to be consul general.
Albert Halstead to be consul general.

CLASS 4.

Joseph I. Brittain to be consul general.
Leo J. Keena to be consul general.
Dominic I. Murphy to be consul general.

CLASS 5.

Maxwell Blake to be consul general.
William Coffin to be consul general.
Philip C. Hanna to be consul general.
Ernest L. Harris to be consul general.
George Horton to be consul general.

Will L. Lowrie to be consul general.
Alexander W. Weddell to be consul general.
Alfred A. Winslow to be consul general.
Edward D. Winslow to be consul general.

CONSULS.

CLASS 2.

Ross E. Holaday to be consul.

CLASS 3.

Frank W. Mahin to be consul.

CLASS 4.

P. Merrill Griffith to be consul.

CLASS 5.

Arminius T. Haeberle to be consul.
Michael J. Hendrick to be consul.
Calvin Milton Hitch to be consul.

CLASS 6.

Marion Letcher to be consul.
Stuart K. Lupton to be consul.
Frederick Simpich to be consul.

CLASS 7.

Clarence Carrigan to be consul.
George C. Cole to be consul.
Henry C. A. Damm to be consul.
Alfred W. Donegan to be consul.
Claude E. Guyant to be consul.
Perry C. Hays to be consul.
William J. Yerby to be consul.

CLASS 8.

Oscar S. Helzer to be consul.
Theodore Jaeckel to be consul.

CLASS 9.

Thomas D. Davis to be consul.
Maurice P. Dunlap to be consul.
John R. Silliman to be consul.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Harland B. Howe to be United States district judge for the district of Vermont.

MARSHAL OF THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA.

Paul McRae, of Virginia, to be marshal of the United States Court for China.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD.

Second Lieut. of Engineers Jesse Wilbur Glover to be first lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Francis Clare Allen to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Charles Herman Johnson to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Clinton Philo Kendall to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Kurt Wolfgang Krafft to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Charles Joseph Odend'hal to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Herbert Norton Perham to be second lieutenant of engineers.

Third Lieut. of Engineers Henry Charles Roach to be second lieutenant of engineers.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE COAST GUARD.

George Wheeler Bowley to be district superintendent.
Edgar Chadwick to be district superintendent.
Edwin Emmet Chapman to be district superintendent.
John Stites Cole to be district superintendent.
Arthur Dominy to be district superintendent.
Silas Hatch Harding to be district superintendent.
Jerome Godfrey Klah to be district superintendent.
Herbert Minot Knowles to be district superintendent.
Gus Brynolf Lofberg to be district superintendent.
Patrick Henry Morgan to be district superintendent.
James Franklin Phillips to be district superintendent.
William Edward Tunnell to be district superintendent.
Otto Gabriel Wellander to be district superintendent.

POSTMASTERS.

NEW YORK.

Charles F. Bergner, Callicoon.
Sidney R. Hooker, Angelica.
Jesse Jacobs, Oxford.
James H. Joy, Fort Ann.
Francis Larkin, Ossining.

Michael J. Manton, Sayville.
David J. McHenry, Granville.
John A. Neafsey, Glen Cove.
W. W. O'Connor, Fort Plain.
Michael J. Spillane, East Syracuse.
Asher C. Stafford, Gowanda.
Maynard A. Thompson, Waverly.
John G. Gibson, Utica.

OHIO.

Welker Besst, West Lafayette.
George O. Canaga, Scio.
Ira A. Deeter, Pleasant Hill.
Charles J. Kessler, New Lexington.
Frank J. Mitchell, Port Clinton.
William P. Moore, Adena.
George F. Parrish, Toledo.
Charles F. Vollmer, Bucyrus.

OKLAHOMA.

Claude Weaver, Oklahoma.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James W. Aikin, Christiana.
Thomas A. Derick, Newville.
Daniel R. Dunkel, Hamburg.
Albert E. Eckert, East Stroudsburg.
Dwight M. Hess, Hellwood.
Harry R. Schneitman, Elizabethtown.
George D. Schoenly, Boyertown.
John W. Warehime, Waynesboro.
Adam Wise, Gap.
Clarence H. Young, Manheim.

WEST VIRGINIA.

John Haynes, Hinton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 22, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for all the disclosures Thou hast made of Thyself in the material universe, in the written word, in the great men whom Thou hast raised up from time to time, who have left the impress of their characters on their respective ages, and by their deeds advanced the conditions of mankind. Our thoughts turn to-day to our revered Washington, whom we rightly call the "Father of his Country." For in its sacred institutions, its genius, he lives, a beacon light to guide the ship of state ever onward to the betterment of humanity. We thank Thee for what he was, for what he did, for the inspiration which impels to citizenship, patriotic zeal, and Christian manhood. Not only the American people but the liberty-loving people round the world will celebrate in song and story his birth, life, and deeds as a patriot, soldier, statesman. Help us to follow his illustrious example and emulate his virtues; and Thine be the praise, in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 20, and of Sunday, February 21, 1915, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 19009. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7362. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain lands to the State of Utah and to accept relinquishment from the State of Utah of certain other lands in lieu thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 21318. An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the two appropriation bills just reported back from the Senate.

Mr. MANN. There are no points of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is not the time for reservation of points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves all points of order on the two appropriation bills just sent over from the Senate.

JOSEPH ELIOT AUSTIN.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2642) authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy, to which there is a Senate amendment; and I ask unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks to take this bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I should like two or three minutes on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy. The bill was introduced in the House on April 14, 1913, and reported to the House on July 9, 1914. The report to the House did not show that the bill had been referred to the Secretary of the Navy for information or suggestions, although the committee had in its files a letter from the Secretary of the Navy dated December 18, 1913, not only opposing the passage of the bill, but giving rather detailed information concerning it and suggesting that if it were passed a certain amendment ought to be agreed to.

I do not think it is quite fair to the House for one of the committees of the House to have information of this character and suppress it when reporting a bill to the House. It seems to me that when one of the committees refers a bill to a department for information and obtains information from the department, in justice to the House that information ought to be reported to the House instead of being allowed to sleep quietly in one of the pigeonholes of the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. I wish to state that I have never seen the report of the committee. I designated one of the members of the committee to report the bill, and he prepared the report. I do not know what is in it or what is left out of it. So that I have no information whatever as to the matter about which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. MANN. I do not know who actually prepared the report, whether it was the clerk of the committee or a member of the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know myself. I have never seen the report.

Mr. MANN. However that may be, there was information from the Navy Department giving quite a full statement of facts in reference to this matter. The House was informed of facts in direct conflict with the statement of the Secretary of the Navy, without any reference to the letter which the Secretary of the Navy had sent to the committee reporting upon this bill. If the Committee on Naval Affairs or other committees desire to stand in good odor in the House, when they have information reported to them officially from the department they ought to furnish that information to the House instead of concealing it. It never would have been known in the House that there was such a letter if it had not been for the action of the Senate. The Senate committee printed the letter in their report and acted upon it, but the letter from the Secretary to the committee of the House was printed by the Senate instead of being furnished to the House by the House committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. WITHERSPOON, Mr. TRIBBLE, and Mr. BUTLER.

PROPOSED EVENING SESSION ON WEDNESDAY.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next the House take a recess at not later than 5.30 p. m. until 8 p. m., and that there be a meeting of the House at 8 o'clock to continue not later than 11.30 p. m. for consideration of bills on the Private Calendar which are not objected to, and also for the consideration of bills which have been amended in the Senate, after having been passed by the House by unanimous consent at these night meetings. I ask that the bills be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

I would like to say that there is a part of the Private Calendar that has never been called at all, and at that meeting I shall ask that the calendar be first completed, so that every bill on the calendar have an opportunity to be considered by unanimous con-

sent one time. After the calendar is completed I will ask that the bills which have been amended by the Senate be taken up, after which the entire Private Calendar be taken up. That will give a chance to go over it again and take up such bills as are not objected to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. I did not hear the first part of his request. There is a bill on the Private Calendar reported from the Committee on War Claims which is unfinished business. Is this limited only to claims or does it embrace war claims?

Mr. POU. The entire Private Calendar.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. There is a bill that was reported from the Committee on War Claims that is the unfinished business. Would that be unfinished business on the calendar, first to be taken up and disposed of?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman sure of his facts?

Mr. PADGETT. It is the case of Cheairs.

Mr. MANN. Is not that bill still pending in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And not reported?

Mr. PADGETT. It has not been reported by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think it is quite fair to the membership of the House to stay in session from 11 o'clock in the morning and continue in session until 11.30 o'clock at night for the consideration of these bills. I think it would not be objectionable—at least it would not from my standpoint—if the gentleman should make it from 8 o'clock until 10.30 o'clock at night, but to stay until 11.30 o'clock at night is an undue punishment.

Mr. POU. I said, not later than 11.30 o'clock.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think if the gentleman will put the limit at 10.30 o'clock we would be doing a very good day's work.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman change his request to 10.30 o'clock?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to yield to me for a minute. This private calendar has not been called at all at this session, and a good many gentlemen are interested in having it called, and if they are willing to stay it seems to me that they ought to have the opportunity. We have had to stay on other matters that long.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will inform the gentleman that only a very few bills on the calendar have not had their day in court. We virtually completed the calendar at the last session when we ran until 11.30 o'clock at night. There were only a handful of Members present at that hour. They were very tired, and I think it is consistent with fair consideration of the bill that Members should not be asked to stay until they become fatigued.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman is right, there will not be a very late session.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not understand the proposal, because we could not take up the bills that are objected to.

The SPEAKER. Answering the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee, it seems to the Chair that that is the first bill to be taken up.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, of course the only opportunity to consider any of these bills will be by unanimous consent, and the only chance to get a night session is by unanimous consent. I will amend the request and make it 11 o'clock, and I hope the gentleman will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that on next Wednesday at 5.30 o'clock the House shall stand in recess until 8 o'clock p. m., and have a night session to extend not later than 11 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar that are not objected to, and that the bills shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman knows that next Wednesday is not Calendar Wednesday, and that the House may be engaged in the consideration of an appropriation bill, not only may be but probably will be, and very likely will want to stay late if Members are willing to stay here in the consideration of appropriation bills. When the gentleman had the night session before it was Calendar Wednesday, a day when they could not consider the appropriation bills. Next Wednesday is not Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. POU. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MANN. I suggest that we do not have that meeting that night, and I object.

Mr. POU. Would the gentleman object to Thursday night?

Mr. MANN. I object to any night at all until we know what we have done with the appropriation bills. I think it is much more important that we finish the business of this session and not have an extra session than it is to pass a few private bills which have no chance of being passed in the Senate in any event.

Mr. POU. Would the gentleman object to to-night? There are a good many gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber who have asked me to make this request.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] does not object, I do not know what I would do. I should hope that he would object to that.

Mr. POU. It is the last chance the Private Calendar is going to have, in all probability.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that the House bills on the Private Calendar that have been passed now have not very much chance of being considered in the Senate.

Mr. POU. They have some chance.

Mr. MANN. The Senate can not pass one-quarter of the bills that we have sent over to them.

Mr. POU. I will say this, that there are quite a number of bills that have been amended by the Senate, and we want to dispose of those bills first. I suppose there have been a score of gentlemen on both sides of the aisle who have asked that this request be made, and I make it. That is all I can do.

Mr. MANN. I should think most of the House bills with Senate amendments might easily be disposed of without having a night session. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21491, the fortifications appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is District day, and I hope that that motion will not prevail.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky) there were—ayes 66, noes 35.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 179, nays 101, answered "present" 2, not voting 141, as follows:

[Roll No. 84.]

YEAS—179.

Adair	Fergusson	Kirkpatrick	Raker
Allen	Fess	Knowland, J. R.	Rauch
Anderson	FitzHenry	Konop	Reed
Ashbrook	Fordney	La Follette	Reilly, Wis.
Austin	Foster	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.
Bailey	Frear	Leshner	Rogers
Baker	Gard	Lieb	Rubey
Baltz	Gardner	Lindbergh	Rucker
Bathrick	Gerry	Lloyd	Russell
Beakes	Gillett	Lobeck	Scott
Boober	Gilmore	Logue	Shackleford
Borchers	Goeke	Loneragan	Sherley
Bowdle	Good	McAndrews	Sherwood
Britten	Goulden	McKenzie	Shreve
Brown, N. Y.	Gray	Madden	Sinnott
Brown, W. Va.	Greene, Mass.	Maguire, Nebr.	Slemp
Brumbaugh	Guernsey	Manahan	Sloan
Buchanan, Ill.	Hamilton, Mich.	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Bulkley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mapes	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamlin	Miller	Stafford
Burke, Wis.	Hart	Mitchell	Stephens, Nebr.
Butler	Haugen	Mondell	Stevens, Minn.
Calder	Hawley	Moore	Stevens, N. H.
Callaway	Hayden	Morgan, Okla.	Stone
Campbell	Hayes	Morrison	Stout
Casey	Helgesen	Moss, Ind.	Stringer
Chandler, N. Y.	Helvering	Moss, W. Va.	Sutherland
Clancy	Hill	Mulkey	Switzer
Cline	Hinds	Murdock	Taggart
Connelly, Kans.	Hinebaugh	Neeley, Kans.	Talcott, N. Y.
Cooper	Howell	Neely, W. Va.	Taylor, N. Y.
Cox	Hughes, W. Va.	Nelson	Temple
Cramton	Hullings	Nolan, J. I.	Ten Eyck
Cullop	Humphrey, Wash.	Norton	Thacher
Danforth	Igoe	Padgett	Thomson, Ill.
Davis	Johnson, Utah	Palmer	Towner
Dershlem	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Underwood
Dickinson	Kahn	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Dillon	Keating	Patten, N. Y.	Walsh
Dixon	Kelley, Mich.	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Doolittle	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	White
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Phelan	Williams
Esch	Kent	Platt	Winslow
Evans	Key, Ohio	Post	Young, N. Dak.
Falconer	Kinkaid	Powers	

NAYS—101.

Abercrombie	Doughton	Hughes, Ga.	Smith, Md.
Adamson	Dupré	Hull	Smith, Tex.
Aiken	Eagle	Humphreys, Miss.	Sparkman
Aswell	Edwards	Jacoway	Stanley
Barkley	Ferris	Johnson, Ky.	Stedman
Bartlett	Fields	Johnson, S. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Barton	Finley	Kitchin	Stephens, Tex.
Beall, Tex.	Flood, Va.	Lafferty	Sumners
Bell, Ga.	Floyd, Ark.	Lazaro	Taylor, Ala.
Blackmon	Gallagher	Lee, Ga.	Taylor, Ark.
Borland	Garner	McKellar	Thomas
Brockson	Garrett, Tenn.	MacDonald	Thompson, Okla.
Broussard	Garrett, Tex.	Moon	Tribble
Buchanan, Tex.	Glass	Murray	Vaughan
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Oldfield	Vinson
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Page, N. C.	Watkins
Candler, Miss.	Gregg	Park	Watson
Caraway	Hardy	Pou	Weaver
Carlin	Harris	Quin	Webb
Church	Harrison	Rainey	Whaley
Clark, Fla.	Heflin	Rayburn	Wingo
Collier	Helm	Rothermel	Witherspoon
Crisp	Henry	Rouse	Young, Tex.
Davenport	Holland	Saunders	
Dent	Houston	Sisson	
Dies	Howard	Small	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Browning Hay

NOT VOTING—141.

Ainey	Drukker	Kiess, Pa.	Prouty
Alexander	Dunn	Kindel	Ragsdale
Anthony	Eagan	Korby	Reilly, Conn.
Avis	Edmonds	Kreider	Riordan
Barchfeld	Elder	Langham	Roberts, Nev.
Barnhart	Estopinal	Langley	Rupley
Bartholdt	Fairchild	Lee, Pa.	Sabath
Bell, Cal.	Faison	L'Engle	Scully
Brodbeck	Farr	Lever	Seldomridge
Browne, Wis.	Fitzgerald	Levy	Sells
Bruckner	Fowler	Lewis, Md.	Sims
Bryan	Francis	Lewis, Pa.	Slayden
Burgess	French	Lindquist	Smith, Minn.
Burke, Pa.	Gallivan	Linthicum	Smith, N. Y.
Burnett	George	Loft	Smith, Saml. W.
Cantor	Gill	McClellan	Steenerson
Cantrill	Gittins	McGillicuddy	Stephens, Cal.
Carew	Goldfogle	McGuire, Okla.	Talbott, Md.
Carr	Gordon	McLaughlin	Tavener
Carter	Gorman	Mahan	Taylor, Colo.
Cary	Graham, Ill.	Maher	Townsend
Claypool	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Treadway
Coady	Green, Iowa	Metz	Tuttle
Connolly, Iowa	Greene, Vt.	Montague	Underhill
Conry	Griest	Morgan, La.	Vare
Copley	Griffin	Morin	Vollmer
Crosser	Gudger	Mott	Walker
Curry	Hamill	O'Brien	Wallin
Dale	Hensley	Oglesby	Walters
Decker	Hobson	O'Hair	Wilson, Fla.
Deltrick	Hoxworth	O'Shaunessy	Wilson, N. Y.
Difenderfer	Jones	Paige, Mass.	Woodruff
Donohoe	Keister	Peterson	Woods
Donovan	Kelly, Pa.	Plumley	
Dooling	Kennedy, Conn.	Porter	
Driscoll	Kettner	Price	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LOFT (for Sherley motion) with Mr. Wilson of Florida (against).

Mr. CANTOR (for Sherley motion) with Mr. WALKER (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. DALE with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. COADY with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. CARY.

Mr. DONOHUE with Mr. CURRY.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. FARR.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FAISON with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. GORDON with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. LANGHAM.
 Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. LANGLEY.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut with Mr. LINDQUIST.
 Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. McLAUGHLIN.
 Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. PLUMLEY.
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. PROUTY.
 Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. RUPLEY.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MARTIN.
 Mr. PETERSON with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. SLOAN.
 Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. WALLIN.
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.
 Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. STEPHENS of California.
 Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. STEENERSON.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. WOODRUFF.
 Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. WALTERS.

For the session:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I have a general pair with my colleague [Mr. SCULLY], who is absent. I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. BROWNING was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present; the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21491, the fortifications appropriation bill, with Mr. HOUSTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been customary for several years past, upon the anniversary of the birthday of Washington to have read his Farewell Address. It is a custom that I am sure all feel should be continued, and I therefore take great pleasure in yielding 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] for the reading of Washington's Farewell Address. [Applause.]

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee read as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you at the same time to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that in withdrawing the tender of service, which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this previous to the last election had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence impelled me

to abandon the idea. I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety, and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed toward the organization and administration of the Government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is intended to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me, still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me, and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which, and unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts and a guaranty of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which can not end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger natural to that solicitude urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation and to recommend to your frequent review some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively, though often covertly and insidiously, directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest

even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together. The independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes in different ways to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water will more and more find, a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While, then, every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined can not fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations, and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government, which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western—whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular

districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You can not shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head. They have seen in the negotiation by the Executive and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties—that with Great Britain and that with Spain—which secure to them everything they could desire in respect to our foreign relations toward confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the constitution which at any time exists until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction; to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put in the place of the delegated will of the Nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community, and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans, digested by common counsels and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Toward the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what can not be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember especially that for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable.

Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual, and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind—which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight—the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the Government and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This, within certain limits, is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose; and there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections

with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives; but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object, which is always a choice of difficulties, ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the Government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct. And can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in the place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur.

Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity and adopts through passion what reason would reject. At other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often—sometimes, perhaps, the liberty—of nations has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the conces-

sions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils. Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter. Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence—I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens—the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interests, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it—for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the Government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place

itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our Nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good—that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated the public records and the other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest to take, a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined as far as should depend upon me to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity toward other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence, and that, after 45 years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love toward it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES, 17th September, 1796.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time the gentleman consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty minutes have been consumed.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] use some of his time.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, to-day, the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country, it seems appropriate to discuss questions vital to the general welfare of the people, in

which he was so deeply interested. It seems fitting to speak of policies of this Government affecting the prosperity of the country, and to discuss the wisdom of certain important legislation. I refer to recent legislation directly affecting the revenues of the Government and indirectly affecting American industry and labor and the happiness of the Nation. It is generally known that revenues at present are not sufficient to meet the running expenses of the Government and that the prosperity of the Nation is at ebb tide. What has brought all this about?

In beginning I wish to say to my Democratic friends that when you differ with me and my associates on this side of the House, the Republican Party, on this great question I wish to give to you credit for being honest and sincere in your belief. I know that I am sincere in mine. I know that other men who believe as I do are sincere in their belief. And with that statement I say that when we differ with you we differ with you in the policies advocated by your party.

On September 4, 1914, in this Chamber, the President of the United States, in a message to Congress urging the immediate enactment of the so-called war-tax measure, called attention to the fact that customs receipts for August, 1914, had fallen far short of customs receipts for the corresponding month one year previous, and said:

I need not tell you to what this falling off is due. It is due, in chief part, not to the reductions recently made in the customs duties, but to the great decrease in importations, and that is due to the extraordinary extent of the industrial area affected by the present war in Europe.

How much was this "great decrease in importations," to which the President refers? Our imports for August, 1913, amounted to \$137,600,000, and our imports for August, 1914, were \$129,700,000, or a loss of a little less than \$8,000,000, a falling off of 5.8 per cent. Now, let us see what we lost in customs receipts. In August, 1913, customs receipts amounted to \$30,930,000. In August, 1914, customs receipts were \$19,430,000, or a loss of \$11,500,000. In other words, the loss in customs receipts amounted to 37.2 per cent. Let me repeat, comparing August, 1913 (with a Republican tariff law in force) with August, 1914 (with a Democratic tariff law in force), we lost \$11,500,000 in customs receipts on a loss of imports amounting to less than \$8,000,000. Our total imports decreased 5.8 per cent, and our customs receipts fell off 37.2 per cent, yet our President would have us think this loss of revenue was due to the falling off in imports due "in chief part" to the war in Europe.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will, but I have such a limited time I would like if the gentleman would just ask a brief question.

Mr. GORDON. The question is this: Is it not a fact that the revenue-paying imports fell off in a very much greater percentage than those which paid no revenue?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not think the gentleman is right. Under the present law our imports on the free list are 63 per cent. They were upward of 50 per cent under the Payne tariff law. Our total imports decreased 5.8, as I have said, and the customs receipts fell off 37.2. It is true that when wool and other farm products went on the free list under the terms of the Democratic tariff law, revenue-paying imports showed a decline, and when sugar goes on the free list in May, 1916, our revenue-producing imports will suffer an additional serious setback.

Under the Democratic tariff law the Government is collecting approximately 13.35 per cent ad valorem in customs duties on the total imports. A decrease of \$8,000,000 in importations at 13.35 per cent ad valorem should cause a loss in customs receipts of \$1,040,000; but we lost \$11,500,000. That loss in customs receipts was not due in chief part to a decrease in imports, as stated by the President. Such a contention is absurd. Ninety and four-tenths per cent of that loss in customs receipts was due to lower rates of duty, and but 9.6 per cent was due to the decrease in importations.

Some friends of the new tariff law have pointed to the customs receipts for the month of October, 1913, as evidence that the new law was an adequate revenue producer. That was the first month of the life of the Underwood tariff law and customs receipts amounted to a little over \$30,000,000. However, the reduced tariff rates on sugar did not go into operation for several months thereafter, and wool did not go on the free list until December, 1913; and the reduced rates of duty on woolen goods became effective January, 1914. Moreover, large quantities of goods imported before October were held in bond until after the new law went into effect and were released that month and duty was paid thereon. Our total imports for October, 1913, amounted to \$132,000,000.

In October, 1914—with the war raging in Europe—our imports amounted to \$138,000,000, or an actual gain in imports of

\$6,000,000. How about customs receipts? Comparing October, 1913, and October, 1914, imports increased, as before stated, \$6,000,000; but customs receipts showed a loss of \$14,000,000. Will anyone contend this loss in customs receipts was due in chief part to a decrease in imports? In October there was no decrease in imports, but imports actually increased; but customs receipts fell off from \$30,000,000 to \$16,000,000, a loss of \$14,000,000. There is but one answer, gentlemen—your tariff rates are too low.

In considering our revenues it is instructive to know the ad valorem rate of duty collected on our total imports under the Payne tariff law and under this new Democratic tariff law. I have taken our total imports and customs receipts for a two-year period ending June 30, 1913. During that period our customs receipts amounted to 18.13 per cent ad valorem of the total imports. That is, the ad valorem rate of duty collected under the last Republican tariff law. I then took the total imports and customs receipts for the 12 months ending December 31, 1914, and find the average ad valorem rate under the present tariff law to be 13.35 per cent.

In arriving at that rate—13.35 per cent ad valorem—under this new law, I deducted from the customs receipts collected for the calendar year of 1914 a portion of the duty collected on sugar for January and February, 1914, amounting to the difference between the rate fixed in the Underwood tariff law and the Payne tariff law, because the duty on sugar in the Underwood tariff law carried the rate fixed by the Payne tariff law to March 1, 1914.

During the calendar year of 1914 imports amounted to \$1,789,523,000, on which were collected \$238,983,000 in customs receipts. If an ad valorem rate of duty of 18.13 per cent, the rate under the Payne law, had been collected on those imports, it would have produced \$324,440,000 in customs receipts, which is no less than \$85,457,000 more than you are collecting under the present ad valorem rate of duty.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a very brief question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. He stated that under the Payne-Aldrich tariff we would have had \$85,000,000 more?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Is not that an admission that even under the Aldrich tariff we would have had a deficiency?

Mr. FORDNEY. We would have had if we had kept up your extravagant appropriations. [Applause on the Republican side.]

According to the terms of the new tariff law, one year from May 1 next sugar will go on the free list. At present in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000 per year is being collected in duty on imported sugar. The Democrats will lose that \$50,000,000 per year after April, 1916. At present, notwithstanding the so-called war tax and the corporation and income tax, the Democrats are not obtaining sufficient revenues to meet the running expenses of the Government. What will you do, my friends, next year, when your difficulties are increased by some \$50,000,000? It seems to me Democrats in power will be compelled to do one of four things:

First. Enact an additional so-called war-tax measure.

Second. Resort to a bond issue.

Third. Increase rates of duties on imports.

Fourth. Materially reduce the expenditures of the Government.

One of the planks in the platform on which the Democratic Party came into power promised "Freedom from oppressive taxation." You made the people of the country believe they were oppressed by the Republican policy of raising revenue. They are now beginning to realize they did not know what taxation was until the Democrats took control of affairs. The people were allured by your political pledges and promises, but now they are being disillusioned by a realization of Democratic shortcomings.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. You suggest four courses to follow by the party now in power to meet the conditions at that time. Might you not suggest a fifth, which will be the one probably taken—the turning of the affairs, fiscal and otherwise, over to a party who knows how and will be able to take care of them?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; and I hope to be one of that party.

In recent legislation, it appears to me, the hands at the wheel have been guided by wild ideals, unbalanced theories, poor business training, and an overwhelming desire to satisfy popular clamor.

You promised to reduce the cost of living, and proceeded to enact laws that must necessarily increase the cost of production. Your legislation is stopping the wheels of progress. Every law that adds to the cost of production, by imposing additional

obligations on the producer, increases the necessity for a protective tariff law. When foreign countries prohibit child labor and when foreign countries increase wages and the standard of living of the laboring classes, then, and not until then, can we adopt such laws and hope to prosper under a low-tariff policy. It is absurd to think otherwise.

Of the cost of production of a yard of cotton in a cotton mill in the State of New Jersey, as given by the proprietor of a factory in that State, 60 per cent goes to labor, 34 per cent is paid for raw material, and 6 per cent for overhead charge; but the so-called raw material of the manufacturer is the finished product of the farmer and cotton gin. With transportation charges figured in, at least 80 per cent of the cost of the raw material goes to labor, either on the farm or in transportation. Considering the labor cost in the raw material, labor receives approximately 87 per cent of the total cost of production of a yard of cotton.

The labor cost in the factory, however, receives about 60 per cent of the total cost of production, and in the New Jersey cotton mills this labor received an average of \$1.42 per day. The same class of labor in the cotton mills of Japan received but 17½ cents per day. In other words, the Japanese labor cost is but one-eighth of the labor cost in the State of New Jersey. In cotton costing 10 cents per yard to produce, the labor employed in the factory received 6 cents per yard. That same work in the factories in Japan is done for three-fourths of 1 cent per yard. It will be seen from this that the Japanese manufacturer has an advantage of 5½ cents per yard in labor cost over the American manufacturer in making cotton goods costing 10 cents per yard to produce. In other words, the Japanese total cost of production of that grade of cotton is more than 50 per cent less than the cost in American mills.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Before the gentleman leaves that question, I should like to ask a question relative to the falling off of revenues since the war began.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will reach that in just a few minutes, if the gentleman will permit. I have that correctly. In the cost of a yard of cotton in this country, measured on a pound weight, let me say to you that in a medium grade of cotton the labor cost is six-tenths of the total cost. Rather, six-tenths of the cost of the production of that yard of cotton is labor cost after the material has reached the factory. That is on a basis, my friends, of an average wage scale paid in the cotton factories north of the Mason and Dixon line of \$1.40 a day for the labor employed in the cotton mills. When Japan purchases our raw cotton from us, which she does chiefly as to the cotton used in her cotton mills, she purchases her raw material at practically the same price at which these cotton mills north of the Mason and Dixon line purchase their raw material. The only additional cost to them is the freight by water from the Pacific coast to Japan, which is a trifle. But I have here, my friends, official figures to show that in Japan, according to a report made by an American consul on December 15, 1914, there are 863,000 employees in factories operating machinery which is run by steam or other kind of power.

There are a great many employed in shops where there is no machinery and where less than 10 people are employed; but in those Japanese factories, numbering some 8,000 all told, there are 863,447 employees, according to that report of December 15, 1914, 514,000 of whom are females and but 349,000 are males. Of this total number 60,000, or 7 per cent, are children under 14 years of age. The average wage paid to men in all the factories in Japan is 26.4 cents per day in gold; to female labor in factories in Japan the wage is 13.2 cents per day; and to juvenile labor, boys, the wage is 9½ cents per day, and to girls under 14 years of age the wage is 7½ cents per day, or a total average wage to all employees in all the factories of Japan of 17½ cents a day.

The other day Democrats of the House almost went into hysteria over a bill presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] intended to regulate the employment of certain child labor in this country. To be correct, that bill, if enacted into law, will prohibit the transportation from one State to another of the product of any quarry or factory in the United States in the making of which child labor has been employed to any extent. The fact that such legislation might increase the cost of production in American institutions seems to have been given no consideration whatsoever. It has also been argued that such a law would keep child labor from displacing adult labor. Gentlemen, is your course at this time consistent with other legislation you have enacted? Are you sincere in your desire to protect adult labor from competition with child labor? I think not. I do not want to appear as an opponent to child-labor legislation; quite the contrary; but I strongly oppose your inconsistent course. Consider the enormous

amount of child labor abroad and the beggarly wages paid; consider your recent tariff legislation which throws the product of American institutions in competition with the product of child labor in foreign countries, receiving but a small fraction of the wages paid to similar labor in this country. Why do you not protect our labor of all classes from the great mass of products from foreign lands, made by millions of child laborers abroad? [Applause on the Republican side.]

First, you should enact laws that will enable the father to find employment with ample pay, so that he may feed and clothe his child; then child-labor legislation will appear more feasible to me. You should protect the labor of this country from importations of products from abroad, where the price to all labor, both child and adult, is only one-eighth of the wage paid to the average employee in the mills of this country.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Have we any protection at all under the present tariff conditions in the United States against the products of that Japanese child labor?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; we have not. As an illustration, my friend, on woven cloths, cotton goods produced in Japan, our duty is 30 per cent ad valorem under the Underwood tariff law, and upon a yard of cloth which costs 10 cents per yard as we turn it out at our factories the difference in labor cost is 5½ cents a yard. Now, I ask, will 3 cents per yard duty give adequate protection to the labor employed in the cotton mills of this country? That tariff duty amounts to only 3 cents a yard, when the Japanese labor cost is 5 cents per yard below our labor cost on such goods. I say, no. There is no protection at all in that. If you wish to drown me, all that is necessary for you to do is to put me under water just 1 inch, and I will drown just as quickly as if you put me 10 feet under water. [Laughter and applause.] Your tariff law is below a protective point.

Mr. MOORE. Our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who is the author of the child-labor bill, seems to think that we would take care of the labor of the United States if we passed such a law prohibiting the transportation of the products of child labor from one State to another. What protection would such a law give us from goods imported under such a condition from a foreign country?

Mr. FORDNEY. None whatever.

Mr. MOORE. On one or two occasions have not our Democratic friends actually voted down measures designed to protect the labor of this country from competition with the products of child labor imported from abroad?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. They voted down an amendment introduced by one of my colleagues from Michigan for that purpose—overwhelmingly voted down that provision which would have prohibited the importation of the products of child labor from abroad.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. How much competition have we from Japan on this class of work?

Mr. FORDNEY. For the calendar year 1914 we imported, among other things, of three products alone to the value of about \$90,000,000 on which child labor was largely used in Japan and China.

Mr. BAILEY. That is not the proposition you really fear, I think.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell you what it is. It is silks, hats, and bonnets, things which your wife and my wife and every other man's wife ought to have the privilege of wearing, and mats and matting. We imported \$11,900,000 worth of these goods from China, and the balance of \$90,000,000 worth came from Japan. Can you picture a more destructive condition to our labor and capital than that, my friend? Our labor and capital last year came in competition with that \$90,000,000 worth of oriental products where labor received but 17½ cents per day—

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Of course the gentleman's argument breaks down entirely when it is recalled that Japan's cotton goods do not come to this market in competition with ours.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes they do. During the calendar year 1914 our total exports to Japan were but \$41,000,000, while imports from Japan amounted to \$105,000,000, an unfavorable

balance of trade with Japan amounting to \$64,000,000. Whether this is manufactures of cotton or otherwise, it is the product of that cheap Japanese labor to which I am referring.

Mr. PALMER. What I wanted to ask the gentleman about especially was this matter of child labor, inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to me in his remarks.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; with all due courtesy.

Mr. PALMER. I just want to get the gentleman's point of view. Would the gentleman be glad if some statesman would rise in some parliament of Europe and make the same statement about our little children of America that he is making to-day in the American Congress about the children of Japan?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not quite get the sense of the gentleman's question.

Mr. PALMER. Well, it is pretty plain.

Mr. FORDNEY. It may be plain to you, but it is not plain to me. What I am in favor of is not only protecting child labor in this country, but protecting all American labor from child labor abroad. I endeavor at all times to be consistent. It seems that some men prominent in public life try to take advantage of and ride to political success on every wave of popular clamor that sweeps over this country, but it is mighty difficult for such men even to appear consistent. It is very popular to say "reduce the cost of living"; it is popular to say "shorten the hours of labor"; it is popular to say "let us increase wages"; but if you increase wages, shorten the hours of labor, and enact all manner of legislation placing restrictions on our industrial institutions, you greatly increase the cost of production. This kind of legislation meets with madly enthusiastic support. Each bill taken separately may appear commendable, but taken together they are inconsistent and not practical. To enact all this kind of legislation and at the same time remove the barrier of protection from foreign importations is highly inconsistent. Yet you profess to see no reason why American industries can not compete successfully without tariff protection with foreign industries employing cheap labor and complying with no child-labor laws, workmen's compensation laws, minimum-wage laws, laws affecting the hours of labor, or laws imposing other restrictions which increase the cost of production. When under such conditions unfavorable to American industries a business depression comes upon us and the wheels of industry are stopped you blame it all on a "state of mind" or "imagination."

Your proposed child-labor law affects only the products of mills and factories, and does not affect farm products. If you are going to be consistent and equitable in your efforts to protect all the poor people and protect the labor of this country, then you must not segregate from the great mass simply the poor people who happen to live in the city engaged in certain kinds of employment and not include in your protection all the others throughout the land.

Mr. PALMER. If that is the gentleman's opinion, he has not read the child-labor law.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have read the proposed child-labor law. You do not include anything that is made on the farm when you exclude from shipment child-labor products from one State to another. You include only the products of the factory or the mines or the quarry.

Mr. PALMER. I thought the gentleman said the contrary.

Mr. FORDNEY. No. You should include all child labor if you wish to be fair to all our people. But in your proposed law you class our industries and our children. Do not understand me that I am in favor of placing this ban on our child labor on our farms; but I say your proposed law is class legislation. Why do you not protect all our laborers against this child labor across the sea? I am criticizing the recent tariff and revenue legislation and the inconsistent course of the Democratic Party.

Mr. PALMER. What I am trying to get from the gentleman is, Does the gentleman approve of this labor of the little children in Japan at 9½ cents a day?

Mr. FORDNEY. No, I do not; but you evidently do.

Mr. PALMER. I do not.

Mr. FORDNEY. You evidently do, because you helped to pass the Underwood tariff law, and by its terms the product of that child labor in Japan and Europe comes into this country, and not only comes in competition with the child labor in this country but comes in competition with the labor of all classes of our people. I voted against that law. You voted for it. You took a prominent part in framing that law, and that tariff law is responsible for heavy imports of foreign-made goods into this country, 63 per cent of which come in free of any duty, practically all of which displaces American labor. Which one of us, then, is the friend of our laborers, you or I? Let the people decide.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will yield, is it not a fact that our friend Mr. PALMER and his colleagues on the Demo-

cratic side actually voted against an amendment to keep the product of child labor out of this country when the convict-labor bill was up?

Mr. FORDNEY. They did, and my friend from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] offered that amendment.

Mr. GILL. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be obliged to the gentleman if he will wait a few minutes. Gentlemen are consuming my time. If I can get more time, I will answer all questions.

Here are official figures just given to me by the Legislative Reference Bureau Saturday last, which show that in Austria 3 per cent of all their employees in their factories are children under 14 years of age, or, in number, 15,521. In England 36,995 children are under 14 years of age and 945,000 of the people employed in the factories of England are under 18, or between 14 and 18 years of age, a total of 19.6 per cent of all the employees in all the factories of England being under 18 years of age.

In Belgium there are 1,710,000 employees over 12 years of age. That is not very definite, but it is reasonable to suppose that a large number are under 14. In France there are 549,000 children, or 18 per cent of all the employees in the factories of France are children. In Germany 440,000 children, or 7.1 per cent of all the factory employees are children. In Italy 228,944, or 10 per cent of all the employees in the factories are under 15 years of age. In Switzerland 51,000 out of 328,000, or 16 per cent of all their employees, are under 18 years of age, chiefly under 14 years of age. There are 2,268,448 children employed in the mills in those countries abroad which I have referred to. Millions upon millions, hundreds of millions of dollars of the products of that labor come into this country annually, and yet you voted to lower the duties on those imports, to throw down the bars, and invite the whole world to come in and bring their products to our market and depress the earnings of the American laboring man. By such legislation, my friends, American labor has been thrown out of employment, as you know and I know; and if I only had the time I would call your attention to the various industries that are to-day laying off and have laid off multitudes of men, till the number now reaches 3,000,000 of idle, unemployed labor in the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FORDNEY. Just let me conclude this statement. In all these factories in Japan the total daily wages paid to 863,000 employees amount to \$153,000 a day, while in 1913 one single great corporation in this country, the United States Steel Corporation, employed 246,000 people and paid an average wage of \$2.91, or a total of \$715,000 a day, four and one-half times the daily wages paid to all the employees in all the factories in Japan. In other words, one corporation in the United States paid to 246,000 employees four and one-half times the daily wages paid in Japan to 863,000 employees.

Gentlemen, that is a striking illustration. By free trade or a tariff for revenue only you can not lift up the cheap labor of the whole world to our standard of life and living, but you are sure by such laws to bring down to the general level our standard of life and living by free trade, or a tariff for revenue only; because a tariff for revenue law is only the grandmother of free trade. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] You would not have any tariff at all, except for the purpose of raising revenue. That is your argument. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Michigan is a very able and prominent advocate of a higher tariff, is he not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Higher than the one you have now.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want a protective tariff—

Mr. BORLAND. You want a higher tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want a higher tariff than you and your party do.

Mr. BORLAND. Now let me ask you if it is not true that during the time of the high tariff, which the gentleman helped to frame and voted for, child labor was exploited in this country to a worse extent than it ever was under any other system of revenue, and at the same time were not the wages lower and hours of labor longer for the fathers of these children than they were at any other time?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; the gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. BORLAND. Did that high tariff protect either the father or the child?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; it did.

Mr. BORLAND. Did your high-tariff law protect either the child or the father?

Mr. FORDNEY. I say, my friend, that a protective tariff law that keeps out of our markets the products of cheap labor, whether it is child labor or adult labor, from any foreign

country in the world is beneficial not only to the children but to the fathers and the mothers of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BORLAND. Is that argument or fact?

Mr. FORDNEY. That is a fact, and you know it as well as I do.

Mr. BORLAND. No; I know exactly the contrary.

Mr. FORDNEY. Then get your goggles on, look around you, and read; post up on the subject. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Everybody knows that times were so much better when the Republican system prevailed than they are now that it is useless to argue that question.

Mr. FORDNEY. Why, my friends, right now on Jefferson Avenue in the city of Detroit, a city in the State from which I come and which I have the honor to represent in part, there is a soup house, the first one ever established in that city since God's sun shone down upon that beautiful city. These are Democratic times now, and there is scarcely an important city in this land that has not some sort of establishment doling out something to eat to the unemployed through charity, and you know it.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. There are 10,000 in this city to-day.

Mr. FORDNEY. Ten thousand right here at our doors, and I did not know it.

Mr. BORLAND. And nobody else knows it, either.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. It was announced yesterday in one of the newspapers.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There are 500,000 in Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. BORLAND. Nobody knows any such thing as that, either.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I should have said 5,000.

Mr. BORLAND. Not even that many, when the gentleman from Kansas cuts it down from 500,000 to 5,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. I know the gentleman will be courteous enough to yield the floor to me.

Mr. BORLAND. I apologize to the gentleman for having aroused this disturbance. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for one question?

Mr. FORDNEY. My time is so limited, please be brief.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the gentleman to say that imports at this time are less than they were under the former tariff law.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; I have not said anything of the kind. I say the customs receipts are less. For instance, take the month of December, 1914. Our exports for that month, owing to the great demand for many of our supplies because of the European war, exceeded any month in the history of our country with the exception of four.

Our imports fell off \$70,000,000 for December, 1914, as compared with December, 1913; but if the gentleman will give me time I have a statement right here, the official figures, that will give all this kind of information.

The imports into this country for December, 1913, exceeded any month in the history of this country since 1906, and our imports for the month of December, 1914, were the lowest importations in any month in the history of this country since 1906. These months are not a fair comparison.

Our loss of balance of trade for the calendar year of 1914—and it is the only year on which we can correctly figure, because it is the only full year in which the Underwood bill has been in effect—was \$369,817,475; and that money which we lost, which we sent abroad to buy products of foreign labor in foreign lands, would have employed at \$50 per month more than 610,000 of the unemployed men now seeking employment and begging for something to do in the United States.

I have here a statement showing the condition of wages paid labor on railroads in this country and in Europe as illustrative of the condition of our standard of pay and theirs. The wages paid in 1913, the last year for which I have statistics, to laborers on railroads in this country averaged \$14.56 per week. In Canada, just across the border, railroad employees received \$12.46 per week. In the United Kingdom they received \$5.36 per week. You would bring us in competition with that labor. In Germany they received \$7.77 per week, and in France an average of \$4.05 per week to all the employees on all the railroads in France.

Germany has Government-owned railroads. Ninety-five per cent of her roads are Government-owned, and it costs more money to build her roads under Government control than it costs to build and equip the finest equipped railroads in the world—the railroads in the United States.

And yet our railroads carried a ton of freight a mile for seventy-two one-hundredths of a cent, while in Germany the charge is 1.42 cents per ton per mile.

My Democratic friends, let me tell you with what you are face to face. You admitted that when you introduced your tariff law in this House that you were going to lose about \$70,000,000 in customs receipts each year. You adopted in lieu of that loss which you figured on, the income-tax law, and you increased the tax on corporations; that is to say, you removed the \$5,000 limitation provided for in the Payne tariff law, on which no tax was paid, and you adopted in its place a so-called war-tax measure. Let me tell you what your war-tax measure has done. When you passed the bill through this House you estimated that the revenue to be derived from that bill this year would be \$107,000,000. The Senate changed the law, and when it came back you estimated the receipts would be about \$90,000,000 annually. You have collected in 2 months and 19 days, additional revenue from internal sources amounting to \$11,000,000. Credit it all to your war-tax measure and you are going to collect according to this rate less than \$50,000,000 this year under the war tax. You are spending more than \$100,000,000 in the expenses of this Government over and above the largest amount ever spent by any Republican administration. I am not criticizing you for that, for it may be necessary with the increase of population, but where are you going for revenue for the increased expenditures? The difference in this and the last fiscal year, up to February 19, was \$57,906,000.

You have widened the breach between your income and the expenditures of this Government to that amount during this fiscal year.

As I have said, you propose now to put sugar on the free list. Ah, my friends, you will recede from that position within 12 months, or you will do one of the three things I have mentioned—you will reduce the expenditures of the Government, you will have a bond issue, or you must go to the collection of greater sums in the customhouses from imports.

I wish I had time to fully discuss this matter.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know that the postal receipts are falling off at the rate of \$20,000,000 a year on account of depression in business and the lack of correspondence?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. MADDEN. And that they are reducing the wages of the men employed in the Postal Department at the rate of \$200 a year on account of the lack of funds?

Mr. FORDNEY. I was not aware of that fact, but do not dispute its correctness. On the 3d day of February, I received a letter from Mr. Gary, chairman of the United States Steel Corporation. He said that on the 3d day of January of this year that company had 150,000 at work, whereas in 1913 they employed 246,000 men, which shows their business to be in a chaotic condition.

Mr. TAGGART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. TAGGART. Did not Mr. Carnegie state before the committee over here that the steel corporation did not want any protective tariff?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; Mr. Carnegie has stated that the steel company needed no protection, but Mr. Carnegie is a bondholder and not a manufacturer. I asked Mr. Carnegie the following question when he was before our committee: "My dear sir, when you were in the business in 1870, what rate of protection did you have?" He said, "Oh, puckachee; I never gave it any thought." And yet he at that time had \$28.50 per ton protection on steel and gave the question no thought. I believe he did—

Mr. WHITACRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITACRE. Is Judge Gary authority for the statement that the cause of the present business depression is that the big business people quit new enterprises, that the railroads refused to make extensions or do any further business for the last year; and do not the figures show that the extension of railroad business so far as freight-car building is concerned is one-half what it was in 1913, and that it is the same way in all other lines?

Mr. FORDNEY. It does not make any difference what Judge Gary said or what I say.

Mr. WHITACRE. Did he say it?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me tell the gentleman a fact. For the first time since the Civil War there is not a mile of new railroad under contract for construction to-day; not a mile, and since 1880 the average construction of railroad mileage in this country, main lines, has been 5,261 miles per year.

Mr. WHITACRE. Right there will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait one moment. There are seven employees per mile on railroads, or in other words, some 40,000 persons per year for the newly constructed railways have been employed in this country for all these years. You, by your legislation, have brought on business depression not only in the steel business, but in every line of industry (that is not directly affected favorably by the war in Europe, such as food supplies and the manufacture of arms and ammunition demanded now by these foreign countries). Business depression extends to nearly every industry all over this land. I am in business. I know. Get into business and find out, my friend. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHITACRE. I am in business and I know, too. Is not this true, according to Judge Gary, that the railroads consume from 40 to 60 per cent of all of the iron and steel, and that they have quit building, and that that accounts absolutely for all of the loss in the iron and steel business for the last year? Is not that a fact?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not a fact, but is partially responsible for this great business depression. Every great industry has curtailed purchases.

Mr. WHITACRE. Then, show us why.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell why.

Mr. WHITACRE. Wait a minute—

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I will not wait another minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am in a small way a purchaser of steel rails, and to-day, in Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, or San Francisco I can purchase German steel rails cheaper than I can buy American steel rails; therefore, I say foreign cheap imports are chiefly responsible for this business depression.

In conclusion, I would say it seems to be the desire of the administration to have the country believe the so-called war tax will be unnecessary as soon as the terrible conflict in Europe is ended; that added customs receipts will make up the deficit. How much would imports have to increase to accomplish this result?

During the 12 months ending June 30, 1913, under a Republican tariff law, customs receipts amounted to \$318,142,000, or an average of \$26,500,000 per month. These customs receipts were collected on imports amounting to \$1,814,000,000 for the year, or an average of \$151,000,000 per month.

Under the Democratic tariff law, from January 1, 1914, to August 1, 1914, a period of 7 months wholly unaffected by the war in Europe, \$156,500,000 of customs receipts were collected, which is an average of \$22,300,000 per month. Imports for these 7 months aggregated \$1,141,094,000, or an average of \$163,000,000 per month. On increased importations amounting to an average of \$12,000,000 per month, customs receipts declined under the new tariff law \$4,200,000 per month. For a year it would mean increased importations over the Republican year of \$144,000,000, with \$50,400,000 lost in customs receipts. For fair argument let us say you have made up this loss in revenue with your income tax, which is giving you the benefit of a serious doubt, and let us say your expenditures exceed Republican expenditures by \$100,000,000, which is expressing it mildly. When free sugar becomes effective it will cause an added loss of revenue of \$50,000,000 per year and decrease the ad valorem rate of duty collected on all imports; but for fair argument let us say you will collect 13.35 per cent duty on the total importations into this country, as at present. It is evident, if the war is ended in Europe and your so-called war tax abolished, that customs receipts must increase approximately \$150,000,000 per year more than the average receipts collected during the first 7 months of 1914, prior to the war in Europe. At 13.35 per cent ad valorem it would be necessary for imports to increase no less than \$1,123,000,000 to provide an additional \$150,000,000 in revenue.

It is not the war in Europe, gentlemen, that is to blame. Your revenue laws and appropriations are not in harmony. The close of the war in Europe will not end your difficulties, gentlemen, but, on the other hand, it will compel you to admit the responsibility of conditions you delight in attributing to the disturbance across the seas.

No better illustration of the folly of the present administration in dealing with the tariff can be had than is afforded by the range of prices in the sugar market during the past year.

When the refining interest appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the Democratic House in 1912, and again in 1913, following the last presidential election, they promised that if the duty were lowered so as to enable them to secure cheaper raw sugar they would cheapen the price of the finished product to the consuming public.

There is absolutely no question—

Said their spokesman, Mr. Lowry, of the Federal Sugar Refining Co.—

but that the consumer will get all the benefit from "free sugar" or a reduction in the tariff rate on raw sugar, with a corresponding reduction in the rate on refined sugar.

The American farmers, who were about to be sacrificed to the greed of the sugar refining combine, warned Congress that sugar would be no cheaper; that the farmers of the United States, the Federal Treasury, and the consumers would suffer and that the Sugar Trust would advance prices just as rapidly as it was relieved of domestic competition. The free-trade element in Congress preferred to believe the Sugar Trust rather than the American farmers, just as that element preferred to take the word of the leather manufacturers when they appeared here six years ago and pleaded for free hides.

In both instances the result has been the same. The leather manufacturers made no reduction in the price of their goods, but in the past six years the American farmers and the United States Treasury have lost millions of dollars as a result of the free-hides folly.

In the case of sugar the whole proceeding has been little less than a scandal. When I addressed the House on September 25 I called attention to a resolution I had offered in the Ways and Means Committee when the war-tax bill was being considered which would permit the State of Louisiana to go before the Supreme Court of the United States and test the legality of the sugar duties as now enforced by the Treasury Department.

The difference in the duty collected by the present administration and the rate which many of the ablest lawyers believe should be enforced amounted, from March 1 to December 31, 1914, to the huge sum of \$15,946,539. This money which was lost to the Federal Treasury inured solely to the benefit of the sugar-refining combine. The consumer did not receive the benefit of one cent of that colossal sum.

The Secretary of the Treasury wrote a letter in which he said it would be "useless" to try a suit which might recover this large amount of money for the impoverished Federal Treasury and which might save even a larger sum during the current year. Fortunately, the Committee on the Judiciary of this House did not agree with him, and a few days ago ordered a favorable report upon a resolution similar to the one I made an unsuccessful attempt to have incorporated in the war-tax bill.

The Judiciary Committee in its report says:

It is suggested that to refuse this permission, asked for by a sovereign State, may set a precedent harassing to the Republic in moments of stress and dangerous in its consequences.

Your committee, therefore, appreciating that the petitioner is a sovereign State, desirous of asserting a right and anxious to shield itself from loss and injury, and that the United States Government, while incurring neither risk nor inconvenience, may as a result derive important benefits, feel constrained to urge that the permission sought be granted by this Congress.

The New York Herald of August 18 last published in conspicuous type an interview with Wallace P. Willett, sugar statistician of New York, dealing with the effect of the European war on the sugar market, in which he was quoted as saying:

The American Sugar Refining Co. on the outbreak of the war adopted a policy of not selling sugar for export at all in order to meet the extraordinary demand, and has kept all of its stock of raw sugar to be refined only and solely for American consumers at prices which up to last Friday were half a cent a pound below the prices of some of the other refiners. That company, in order to avoid undue speculation in sugar by jobbers, retail dealers, and consumers has limited its sales to each purchaser. * * *

If the Government will take steps to stop completely the exportation of sugar to Great Britain and other countries, the present supply and that of 500,000 tons coming in October will reduce prices to somewhere near normal. That is the only way to stop a doubling of the prices of to-day, if the war continues.

The Herald continues:

Inquiry developed the fact that all of the big retail grocery stores, while charging from 7½ to 8 cents a pound for sugar, are limiting their sales to individual customers to from 5 to 25 pounds.

Praise from such a source and the pursuit of a policy so patriotic would seem to entitle the American Sugar Refining Co. to a place among the "good trusts." But instead of keeping its stock "only and solely for American consumers" the public press on January 29 of this year carried a statement sent out from Philadelphia that—

Wholesale grocers and commission men throughout the eastern part of the United States are now paying \$1.07 more per hundred pounds for refined sugar than Great Britain is paying for shipments from the same refineries.

This discrimination in favor of foreign buyers, which is made possible under existing laws, is now the practice of all seaboard refineries, according to the information supplied here to-day by a leading distributor.

WOULD HAVE CONGRESS ACT.

Last week, when the domestic trade was paying the refiners \$4.851 cash per hundred pounds for sugar, the British Board of Trade was purchasing from American producers large quantities at \$3.78.

"It would be exceedingly interesting," said the distributor, "for Congress to demand the production of the books of the American refiners to show the price charged the domestic consumers as against the foreign consumer on the same date, bearing in mind that the refiner in the case of sugar exported is allowed a drawback equal to the amount of the duty previously paid by him for the raw sugar brought into this country."

"QUOTE FIGURES OF REFINERS."

"The present duty on raw sugar from Cuba is approximately \$1.02 per hundred pounds. The refiners' price last week was \$4.95, less 2 per cent for cash, making the net cost to the wholesalers \$4.851. When the refined sugar is exported, however, the Government allows a drawback of \$1.01, making the sale price \$3.841. The figures seem to have been shaded by the British Board of Trade, which enabled them to contract at \$3.78."

The trust was engaged in running up the price of refined sugar at the expense of the consumer in August; it was engaged in the reverse policy of beating down the price of raw sugar at the expense of the farmers two months later. About the middle of October, just as the Louisiana crop was ready for harvest, the Sugar Trust which for years had enjoyed a monopoly of that crop and, as the sole purchaser, had fixed prices to suit itself, announced unexpectedly to the dismayed Louisiana farmers that the American Sugar Refining plant at Chalmette, the largest in the world, would be closed for an indefinite period.

In contrast with its statement issued in August that in view of the threatened shortage sugar would be doled out to the grocers a barrel at a time, the trust now coupled the announcement of the closing down of the Chalmette refinery with the explanation that it was overstocked with sugar. Mr. Charles P. Montgomery, of the American Sugar Refining Co., gave out a statement in New Orleans on October 28 in which he said:

When I came here and read the local papers I was surprised to find that the critics of the company here are so ill informed on the conditions in the sugar markets elsewhere.

In Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and Jersey City, where our company has big plants, there are on hand barrels and barrels of sugar that we can not move. Now even our export chances are cut off. England, you know, has just barred out our sugar in order to keep German beet sugar out of England.

My knowledge of this company dates back three and a half years. I came to it prejudiced because of my activity against it in behalf of the Government when chief of customs. Since that time I have had an intimate knowledge, having been sought by the company to take up its Government business.

It is not generally known that this company has lost heavily since the war broke out. We had contracts calling for the delivery of thousands of sacks of sugar at old prices, and we lived up to these contracts when sugar went to 5.62. We have great stacks of sugar at the Chalmette refinery now that we bought at this high-water price and could sell at about a cent less in the present market.

It is entirely unjust and unfair for the company's critics to attempt to brand it as a "bandit corporation." While such names do the American Sugar Refining Co. no tangible harm, constant attacks tend to put the company in a bad light before the public. The facts do not warrant these attacks, and the facts are not concealed from the public. Anybody interested may come to us and find out the truth. Anybody interested is invited to come down to Chalmette and see the stacks of sugar laying on our hands.

The Sugar Trust in closing the Chalmette refinery attempted to play its old game of intimidation once too often. The governor of Louisiana and the sugar farmers of Louisiana took no stock in the explanation it made for closing down its refining plant on the eve of the crop movement, and the governor directed the district attorney at New Orleans to bring ouster proceedings in the name of the State against the American Sugar Refining Co., which was characterized as a trust operating in restraint of trade. This litigation has not yet been finally determined.

The sugar farmers of Louisiana have this season for the first time in history converted the bulk of their raw product into white table sugars and have sold it in competition with the trust. If the Democratic free-sugar clause in the tariff bill is repealed before all of the American farmers are forced out of the cultivation of sugar, it seems probable that the cane farmers and the beet farmers will in the future be able to compete with the trust for the domestic sugar market.

The cane-sugar farmers, however, have not been permitted to bid for the grocery trade except at a tremendous struggle. Notwithstanding Mr. Montgomery's statement on behalf of the trust, in which he attributed the tremendous stock of sugar on hand as the reason for the closing of the Chalmette refinery on the eve of the Louisiana cane-grinding season, no sooner had the farmers of that State begun to put their table sugars on the market than the trust rushed additional supplies to their already glutted warehouses at Chalmette. Two cargoes of sugar were shipped from Philadelphia in December and early in January of the present year. The second of these shipments in dealing with the tariff can be had than is afforded by the range of prices in the sugar market during the past year. of this last shipment, says:

This total cargo of some 6,000,000 of pounds of sugar, or 3,000 short tons, was brought out by this steamship from Philadelphia around to New Orleans, in the Mississippi Valley, to supply the trade of the

American Sugar Refining Co. for refined sugars. It was unwilling to refine these sugars in New Orleans, and hence brought the sugar from a market where the price for 96 test sugar was about 20 cents per 100 pounds higher than in New Orleans; paid the freight from Philadelphia to New Orleans, and then supplied its trade from New Orleans in the adjacent country and up the river at prices a shade higher than those current in the city of New York. If there were such a god or goddess as Nemesis, or retributive justice, the Sugar Trust in this particular instance has certainly and possibly unconsciously invoked the penalty of that retributive justice upon its own head by this plan of bringing sugars from the North to this market, where there was already an abundant supply both of 96 test sugars and of white granulated sugars, bringing the sugars from a northern center of distribution at an increased cost to a southern center of distribution, and doing it presumably to thwart and interfere with the sale of locally produced white granulated, for which there should be an active demand. In this the trust has added to its many offenses against the sugar industry of Louisiana. This shows a dog-in-the-manger policy of special interference with the white sugar demand that is now reaching all the white sugar producers here, and this 6,000,000-pound cargo of white sugar from Philadelphia comes forward to crush by its competition, if it can, the rapidly growing trade for Louisiana white sugars. * * *

Now, when the hand of the State government is laid upon the Sugar Trust and it feels the criminal halter about its neck, it is driven to every extreme to find some means by which it can justify its course; and yet in bringing white sugars into New Orleans from Philadelphia by the great shipload, instead of accommodating the people of the country in which it makes its living by taking the local sugars, it is really adding insult to injury and is endeavoring as far as it can to prevent the producers of white sugars in Louisiana from getting a fair price for their own product.

The current quotations for 96-test sugar in New Orleans have been held down to about 20 cents per hundred pounds below the New York price, and the freights from Philadelphia to New Orleans aggregate a cost of about 20 cents per hundred pounds for bringing the sugar this way, and thus the Sugar Trust actually pays out 40 cents per hundred pounds, or \$8 per ton, or \$24,000 for this supreme effort that it is now making to damage the sugar planters of Louisiana by bringing in locally, not coals to Newcastle, but New York sugars into New Orleans, where there now exists a large supply of white granulated sugars entirely adequate for the market.

If the Sugar Trust was concerned in the slightest degree with the good of Louisiana, it could have bought large quantities of 96-test sugar here at the lower price and made its own white granulated, and have come into fair competition with the plantation white-sugar producers.

It shows, instead, the indirect and yet bulldozing desire to flood the market with supplies from Philadelphia, and the great steamship *El Rio*, of the Morgan Line, comes to Louisiana with this cargo here purposely to punish those who have been, and are still, endeavoring to whip the trust.

Unhappily for the Sugar Trust, these schemes will not work in Louisiana. Every such effort gives increasing evidence of the absolute insincerity of all of the allegations of the Sugar Trust in their own defense, and gives increased strength to the spirit of resistance that the Sugar Trust has developed in Louisiana. Our people feel that if they could get rid of this octopus, drive it out of the land, it would be far better for all concerned, and that a healthy growth of the sugar industry, developed by fair competition and not by the grasping hand of this monopoly, would result finally in a living chance for the sugar planters of Louisiana. This \$90,000,000 corporation, with its iron hands now endeavoring to strangle the Louisiana sugar industry, with its great sugar refinery at the mouth of the river, ready to take in supplies from Philadelphia rather than from Louisiana at fair competitive prices, should be driven from the land as the common enemy of everyone who loves his State, the land of his birth, or his adopted home.

Notwithstanding the severe blow dealt their industry by the Democratic Party and the machinations of the trust, which is undisturbed under the present supine policy pursued by the Department of Justice, the sugar farmers of this country are making a supreme effort that should meet with the sympathy and support of all fair-minded men. The Louisiana Planter and Sugar Manufacturer, in another recent issue, says:

The Sugar Trust carefully suppressed all efforts to lessen its strangle hold on the sugar industry of Louisiana by boycotting brokers, dealers, and sugar receivers in Louisiana and by notifying distributing brokers throughout the country that to sell their goods they must discontinue all other relations with Louisiana and confine themselves exclusively to the Sugar Trust goods. * * *

The new life that the Louisiana sugar industry is now entering upon probably marks one of the most, if not the most, interesting eras in its history. All of the now great sugar factories of Louisiana can make pure white sugars, can make beautiful yellow crystals, can make fine sirups, and the cane growers of the State can readily produce sugar-cane enough to supply them all, and with these resources a half million long tons of the highest grades of sugar can readily be placed in the Mississippi Valley every year. The beet-sugar people will produce another half million tons, and our own people will then have produced within the limits of the mainland a million tons of sugar, and this can be done with no other effort than that of equalizing the cost of human labor in this country as compared with other countries and as utilized in the sugar industry. We shall hope, and we believe that the good sense of our National Legislature will bring it to the same mind and that even our determined President will be willing to sign a coming sugar-tariff bill which will maintain a schedule of duties equal to those now granted, which duties, we believe, will make our sugar industry permanently survive.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 21161. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, while the echoes of this attack upon American business prosperity is still in the Hall I want to give the gentleman some facts that he has evidently overlooked. I know that he overlooked the facts that I put in the Record a few days ago showing the balance of trade was in our favor on an average of nearly \$300,000,000 a year, and had been since the 1st of December, 1914. I want now to read the following brief extract from the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday morning, February 10, 1915:

FACTORY WHEELS TO HUM—ROEBLING CO., OF TRENTON, PREPARES FOR BUSY TIMES.

TRENTON, N. J., February 9.

"We will begin rebuilding as soon as possible that part of our plant destroyed by fire a few weeks ago," said F. W. Roebing, secretary and treasurer of the John A. Roebing Sons' Co., wire manufacturers, to-day. "When finished, an extra force of men will be put to work at night, so that part of our factory will be running night and day. Things are looking better. There is an improvement."

Mr. Roebing believes that, unless some unforeseen turn in the war takes place, a gradual clearing away of the clouds of depression will start things moving toward normal conditions.

Every manufacturer of automobile tires in Trenton is doing a good business, and orders are increasing. One concern has doubled its output. Another is so pressed that the men are working in three shifts of eight hours each.

Mr. MOORE rose.

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, just one minute. Let me finish this, and then I will yield to the gentleman. I continue:

The Pennsylvania Railroad is about to begin improvements that will cost \$200,000.

The heads of the Roebing concern and of a majority of the rubber factories say the future looks brighter than at any time since the war began.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman mean to say that the great Pennsylvania Railroad is actually going to spend \$200,000 in making improvements?

Mr. BORLAND. In one town. The gentleman will probably find they are continuing improvements in other towns in the same way.

Mr. MOORE. If they were going to expend \$200,000 in Kansas City, would the gentleman rejoice?

Mr. BORLAND. I certainly would.

Mr. MOORE. Why, that is a mere bagatelle. It does not amount to anything.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the chairman of the "sob squad." [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has referred to the Roebing Co. Does he not know that the Roebing Co. are making barbed wire for the European war?

Mr. BORLAND. They are making wire. I do not know the class of wire, and I do not know that the gentleman does.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman notice about the 750,000 railroad men who are going to have their wages decreased? Did the gentleman notice that in the newspapers yesterday?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and I expect to speak upon that at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I would not ask the time of the House at this stage of its proceedings, with so many important measures to be considered in the short time remaining of this session, to make a tariff speech, but so much has been said in this House and in the press of the country about the responsibility of the Underwood tariff law for the depression in business and for the decreased revenues of the Government that I desire to insert in the Record an open letter upon that subject written by the editor of the St. Louis Republic to Mr. Walter S. Dickey, a Republican candidate for the United States Senate in Missouri.

This letter, I think, is a complete and a convincing answer to every criticism that has been made of the Underwood law, and I ask permission to insert it in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

THE TARIFF AND BUSINESS DEPRESSION—AN OPEN LETTER TO WALTER S. DICKEY.

WALTER S. DICKEY,
Kansas City, Mo.

SIR: At the Lincoln Day Young Republican banquet, held in the city of St. Louis, you said, according to the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of the following morning:

"A majority of the people of the United States are again convinced that experimenting in free trade is disastrous to our people. * * * The voters of the United States will hold the Democratic Party responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment. This great, rich, new country requires a protective tariff."

We Democrats welcome this expression of opinion from one who is not a political spellbinder, accustomed to deal in unlimited talk and indiscriminate condemnation of the opposite party, but a Republican business man of standing and experience, who expects his words on economic questions to be taken seriously. I have tried in vain to evoke from the Republican press of the Middle West detailed discussion of the relation of the Underwood tariff to the prevailing business depression. I am glad to put to you certain questions, in view of certain facts, and to invite your full and explicit reply.

We have just received from Washington the Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce for December, giving statistics for the calendar year of 1914. The figures contained in this article are all taken from the publication, and the numbers in parentheses refer to its pages, to aid you in your review of our case.

In 1914, under the Underwood tariff, we imported \$28,000,000 worth of manufactures of iron and steel. (I shall use round figures to avoid confusion.) This was \$5,000,000 less than our importations in 1913 and \$700,000 less than those of 1912 (461). How can Democratic tariff policy with respect to the iron and steel schedule be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment," in view of the fact that we imported less iron and steel manufactures in 1914 under the Underwood tariff than in either of the two preceding years under the Payne-Aldrich tariff?

Take cotton goods. This schedule is one of the protection strongholds. Last year we bought \$60,000,000 worth of manufactured cotton goods abroad (457). But the year before we bought \$65,000,000 worth, and the year before that nearly \$68,000,000 worth. Now, Mr. Dickey, how can Democratic policy with respect to the cotton schedule be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment" in view of the fact that we imported less cotton goods last year under the Underwood duties than in either of the two years immediately preceding under the Payne-Aldrich duties?

Look at the returns on chemicals. Under the Underwood law in 1914 we imported chemicals to the value of \$101,000,000 (456). This was almost exactly the same as the total for 1913, but it was more than \$13,000,000 less than the figures for 1912. How can Democratic policy with respect to the chemical schedule be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment" in view of the fact that we imported \$13,000,000 less chemicals in 1914 under the Underwood act than we did the year before under the Payne-Aldrich Act?

Take Schedule K, wools and woollens. This schedule has been called the "citadel of protection." Here on account of the lowering of rates importations of manufactured goods increased from \$17,000,000 in 1913 to \$44,000,000, nearly 2½ as much (467). But two facts need to be remembered. One is that raw wool imports under free trade increased almost \$30,000,000 worth.

Evidently the American woolen manufacturers could not have been very hard hit or what use would they have had for all this raw material? Nor has the grower suffered. The prices of wool have not fallen on account of free trade; they averaged somewhat higher in 1914 than in 1913. The other fact is that of the 99 sorts of woollens scheduled under the Underwood tariff 16 are taxed at 50 per cent or over, and 60 at 35 per cent or over, while only 17 are lower than 25 per cent, and only 5 lower than 20, this last group containing two duties of 18 per cent and free rags, shoddies, and mungo. (See the Protective Tariff Cyclo-pedia, p. 145.)

Now, Mr. Dickey, you know the history of the wool and woolen schedule, and you remember how North had a desk in Senator Aldrich's office and what Aldrich said about "the tail going with the hide." Do you believe that the changes in Schedule K are "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment"? If so, how do you reconcile the belief with the steady prices for wool and the good demand on the part of American wool manufacturers revealed in import figures?

Let us look at the earthenware, stone and china schedule, a field near akin to that of your own business. Our imports last year were a round million less in value than during the year before and a little less than for 1912 (457). How can Democratic policy with respect to the earthenware, stone and china schedule, be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment," in view of the fact that we imported less of these goods under the Underwood schedules in 1914 than in either of the two years preceding under the Payne-Aldrich schedules?

Last we come to lumber. Here the Underwood tariff puts us on a free-trade basis. And we imported lumber in 1914 to the value of a few hundred thousand dollars less than in either 1913 or 1912 (466). How can Democratic policy with respect to the lumber schedule be held "responsible for the widespread prevailing business depression and lack of remunerative employment" in view of the fact that we imported less lumber last year under Underwood free trade than in either of the two years before under Payne-Aldrich protection?

Perhaps you feel like exercising at this point the American privilege of questioning your questioner and inquiring how the Republic accounts for the depression in the field of international trade, if the tariff has had nothing to do with it? I make haste to answer. The trouble is that the other fellows quit buying of us. They did not "flood the market" with their goods. They stopped taking ours.

The Republic holds that our business has been depressed because, as shown by the export statistics contained in pages 476-486 of the publication I have been quoting, our over-seas customers took of us in 1914 \$13,000,000 less agricultural implements, \$12,000,000 less cars and carriages, \$2,000,000 less chemicals, \$27,000,000 less copper and manufactures of copper, \$232,000,000 less cotton, \$5,000,000 less manufactures of cotton, \$94,000,000 less iron and steel manufactures, and \$39,-

000,000 less wool products and manufactures. They took \$105,000,000 worth more of foodstuffs and food animals than in the previous year, but they cut down other purchases so tremendously that their total purchases were \$377,000,000 less on the year's trade. They demanded our gold instead. They bought of us \$278,000,000 less of raw materials for manufacturing than they did the year before, \$51,000,000 less of manufactures for further use in manufacturing, and \$151,000,000 less of finished manufactures (453).

I do not need to point out to you the fact that this deficiency of \$377,000,000 on the year's business in the international field means far more than a loss of income to that amount on the part of the specific industries concerned, grave as such a loss is. As a practical man, you are familiar with the fact that receipts from productive industry go at once into the channels of trade, and that through the loss of nearly \$400,000,000 of income from the failure of the foreign buyer to purchase goods we were ready to sell, the United States lost an overturn of a vastly larger amount from its domestic trade.

Now, Mr. Dickey, I ask you as a business man whether you ever heard of a receipt for keeping business good when your customers quit buying of you? I ask you, as a student of the tariff, what possible effect the tariff can have on trade balances, except as it restricts the amount of foreign goods coming into the home market? I ask you, as a fair man, what justification can be found in the detailed statistics for 1914 as embodied in the regular official publications for the supposition that the Underwood tariff has in any way affected general business unfavorably during 1914? And I challenge you, as a critic of the tariff policy of the Democratic Party, to say wherein that policy as embodied in the Underwood Act is wrong and what rule the Republican Party proposes to follow in revising the schedules, if it gets the chance. I do not expect you to suggest detailed schedules, of course; that would be absurd. But, so far as general policy goes, what would you recommend be done with the iron and steel schedule, the cotton schedule, the chemicals schedule, the wool schedule, the china and stone ware schedule, the lumber schedule?

I shall be glad to give space to your reply.

EDITOR OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, apart from the tariff activities of this administration, which have just been discussed, was the passage the other day in the House of a shipping bill which contemplated the taking of \$30,000,000 of the people's money to buy foreign ships to discourage American labor. And prior to that a bill was passed, at the instance of the White House, providing that we take \$5,000,000 of the people's money to establish a war-risk indemnity company. The bill was rushed through both Houses, and the President signed it, and the war-risk indemnity company is now a fact. I desire, also, to have it noted that a few days ago we had before us a bill which gives American registry to vessels of foreign construction that are wrecked on the shores of the United States.

All these things dovetail together this morning when we read, under sensational headlines, that an American ship, or, rather, a ship flying the American flag, was sunk by a mine while approaching the port of Bremen. Now, I have no special desire to harrow the feelings of the American people upon this subject. I do not believe we should engage in war because this vessel has been sunk. Some gentlemen may become excited over the question, but to me what appears more serious than anything else just now is the method by which a Democratic administration has made it possible for the American people to become embroiled in a foreign war. The vessel that was blown up yesterday was the *Evelyn*, formerly of the port of Philadelphia, a vessel which was allowed to use the American flag, although built in Glasgow, Scotland, 32 years ago; a vessel that sailed under a foreign flag until she was wrecked upon the north Atlantic coast; a foreign tramp steamer that, by reason of her having been wrecked and repaired in the United States, was given American registry and permitted to use the American flag. In consequence of her being wrecked at 14 years of age, she acquired the opportunity to engage in the coastwise trade. She had the advantages of an American ship, entering into the trade along the Atlantic coast and the Gulf. For a time she ran between Philadelphia and New Orleans. She was not a success, so she was put up at auction and sold, this 32-year-old craft, repaired in 1897. Sold with a sister ship, she is said to have produced about \$54,000. Then the European war broke out. The demand for American ships in the foreign trade was acute, and because of her American registry a great value was placed upon the *Evelyn*. The ship was worth little; the American flag was worth everything. She was sold to New York parties at a good price. She engaged in the business of carrying conditional contraband abroad. The insurance companies were not willing to insure her cargo, it is said, for less than \$400,000. It is a question whether her cargo when she went down was worth \$350,000. Her cargo was largely of cotton which some of our friends wanted to get over into the war zone. It was not a question of saving this Nation from war; it was a question of going to a forbidden territory to enable somebody to make money. Those who sold the cotton and those who speculated in it can readily see the advantage of having the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States establish an insurance company, with a capital of \$5,000,000 of the people's money, to

insure such cargoes when the regular marine insurance companies refuse to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I have not the time. A ship laden with this conditional contraband—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman give me three minutes to finish this?

Mr. CALDER. I yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Here is a ship, rebuilt from a wreck, engaged to go into forbidden territory. She goes there at the risk of whom? Not of the individuals or independent insurance companies concerned, but at the risk of the United States Government. This old ship went over there, backed by the money of the people of the United States, by money taken out of the Treasury of the United States. The gentlemen who own the ship, according to this morning's papers, declined to make any general statement when interrogated last night. As quoted, one of the owners of the vessel says, "This is a risk; a war risk that we take," and he refers all inquiries to Washington. I called up the department this morning to get some information as to this risk, to find out how much the Government is to be mulcted for this loss, but the department and the War Risk Bureau are closed. While we are working in Congress, it is a holiday elsewhere. Meantime we have the word of the owner of the ship who sits calmly in his office in New York and says, "It is a risk we take." Yes; it is a risk—this sending of cargoes where marine insurance companies prefer not to insure. The risk is not so much with the gentlemen who put this risk up to the United States as it is with the Government that went into the war-risk insurance business. The shippers insured their cargo and they are probably all right. It is the people who must pay.

Now, remember, that ship was 32 years old, and wrecked on the Atlantic coast in 1897 and rebuilt. When we begin to purchase ships—

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not. Here is a case in point. It is a loss to the Government of the United States; a money loss to the citizens of the Nation for going into a hazardous business. The question of neutrality, the question whether we shall become involved more seriously than by putting our hands in our pockets and paying this insurance bill, is left for the determination of this administration. I trust the administration will be able to deal wisely with this new war baby of its own creation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CALDER. How much time did the gentleman use?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman consumed seven minutes.

Mr. CALDER. I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, in the 45 minutes I am going to discuss the question of whether we have enough ammunition for our—

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the gentleman to yield to me for a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I may be doing a very discourteous thing, but I hope not, because I am intent upon doing a courtesy. The gentleman who is now about to address the committee ought to have a larger audience. I know of no Member of Congress who has more rightly earned the soubriquet of "a fighting Congressman" than the gentleman from Massachusetts. He has taken up this question of preparedness for war and has maintained it with an ability the like of which has not been excelled in the House. The gentleman has attained a reputation which extends far beyond the ordinary. He has been memorialized by Mr. John O'Keefe in a bit of versification that ought to be preserved. I am going to ask my friend from New York to yield me two minutes.

Mr. CALDER. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Then I ask the Clerk to read this happy introduction of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. It is the tribute of Mr. O'Keefe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OUTJABBERING THE JABBERWOCK.

The bad bazoo can split the air
And rumple up the sky;
The wild whangdoodle in its lair
Gives yells that terrify.
But we have little fear of those
When, scooting down the way
Upon its twenty thousand toes,
With fire just spouting from its nose,
The growling gussiegardner goes
A-gussying all day!

The proud pazazza makes us pause
 Within the side-show tent;
 Upon the jabberwock's red jaws
 Our eyes in awe are bent.
 But what's a mere pezazza's puff
 (Although that breath can slay)
 When, with its gullet spouting guff
 (His larynx being rubber tough),
 The growling gussiegardner gruff
 Goes gussying all day?

The mad magoozlum roves the main
 And swallows up the ships;
 The savage squonkus gives us pain
 With its one thousand grips.
 But they seem Mother Peace's chums
 When, with its warlike neigh,
 With teeth a-champing in its gums
 And ears that beat like muffled drums,
 The horrid gussiegardner comes
 A-gussying all day!

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, and this is Washington's Birthday, and the gentleman has heard that wonderful Farewell Address so admirably read this morning. That address was originally delivered in the gentleman's [Mr. Moore's] own home city of Philadelphia, where liberty was born. Now, Mr. Chairman, if George Washington were to come to life again to-day and were to find that Philadelphia was sending "HAMP" MOORE to Congress, what do you suppose he would think of it? [Applause.] Do you not suppose that he would despair of the future of the country? [Laughter.]

OUR HARBOR DEFENSES MISNAMED COAST DEFENSES.

Mr. Chairman, in the three-quarters of an hour which I have at my disposal I am first going to discuss the question of the ammunition supply which we have for our seacoast defense. Next I am going to discuss the adequacy of the guns in those seacoast defenses, and then if I have any time left I am going to take up the question of the adequacy of the fortifications themselves. I am in hopes that there will not be any dispute about the facts; that I shall be able to come to a framed issue of facts with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], so that the discussion will only be as to whether or not the ammunition, for instance, is sufficient, not as to how much ammunition we have.

SEACOAST AMMUNITION.

Now, as I understand, Mr. Chairman, the situation is this: In 1906 the National Coast Defense Board, known as the Taft Board, recommended that we ought to accumulate before war breaks out enough ammunition to serve all the guns in our seacoast defenses for one hour. The theory was that both coasts would not be attacked at the same time. Therefore it was supposed that it would be possible to transfer ammunition from the Pacific Coast to the Atlantic if we were to go to war with a European power. Conversely it was conjectured that it would be possible to transfer ammunition from the Atlantic to the Pacific Coast if our danger lay in the Pacific Ocean. In other words, the theory was that if there were an equal number of guns on both coasts, then, by this method of transference, instead of one hour's supply, every gun on the threatened coast would have two hours' supply when war came and every gun on the unthreatened coast would be stripped, or practically stripped, of ammunition.

Now, I should be ever so much obliged if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] would follow my statement of the situation, and if he disagrees I wish he would stop me, because I am trying to state the situation fairly. Am I correct so far?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have nothing in which I desire to correct the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to get the thing exact, and I am stating it as I understand it. Is that substantially as the gentleman understands it?

Mr. SHERLEY. As far as I caught what the gentleman said, I will not now disagree with him.

Mr. GARDNER. Well, I was in hopes the gentleman would say that I was correct. I read from the New York Sun, of December 10, a speech alleged to have been delivered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] in New York. He says:

Now, turning to the continental United States, we have still some auxiliaries to the defenses to supply, but the defenses are in splendid condition, and he who would have you believe otherwise is either ignorant or vicious.

Well, I am going to be both ignorant and vicious to-day. First I shall try to persuade you, on the authority of the highest Army officers in the United States, that the ammunition supply is inadequate. I have explained the theory of the ammunition supply laid down in 1906 by the National Coast

Defense Board, or Taft Board, as it was called. But the fact is that we have not given our defenses even the minimum ammunition supply which the board recommended.

The Taft Board decreed one hour's supply for every gun in continental United States as the minimum, but we have refused to make this modest, too modest, provision. In all those years we have not given our coast defenses this one hour's supply. We have given them, from time to time, small doses of money, until now they have accumulated a little less than three-quarters of an hour's battle supply of ammunition. We have given them, to be exact, 73 per cent of the ammunition which was ordained as the minimum, and if you pass this bill you will increase that percentage from 73 to 74½. Mind you, this means 73 per cent of the requisite ammunition, not for the whole coast-defense project, but for that part of our seacoast artillery which has already been provided for in appropriations.

Now, Gen. Crozier, whose testimony is a good deal relied on by the people who take the opposite point of view from that which I take, even he testified that we must have 100 per cent of the moderate ammunition estimate of the National Coast Defense Board and that we must have it now. I refer you to this general's evidence, on page 196 of the hearings:

Gen. CROZIER. I think that, considering the fact that the allowance estimated as proper is a very moderate allowance indeed, we ought to have more than 73 per cent of it now. We ought to have 100 per cent of it.

And that, if you please, is Gen. Crozier who is testifying. Let us see what Gen. Weaver, Chief of the Coast Artillery, says about that allowance. I want to show you the character of the company associated with me in my "ignorant and vicious" views.

On page 68 of the hearings I find:

Gen. WEAVER. I have never personally been able to bring myself to think that a one hour's allowance for continental United States, with the understanding that we should shift from one coast to the other, is a reasonable rule. I think that all of our guns should have at the batteries a two hours' allowance.

Now, on page 194 of the hearings is the following:

Gen. WEAVER. I have always felt personally that the assumption that only one coast would be threatened at one time is an unsafe one on which to base such an important item as ammunition for our defense. In my opinion, we ought to contemplate a condition of affairs which might include both coasts being threatened at the same time. * * * Having in mind past experiences during the Civil War and the Spanish War and the excitable nature of our people who live on the coast, a couple of cruisers on one coast would be sufficient to hold intact both the personnel and the matériel on the least threatened coast.

There is that "ignorant and vicious" Gen. Weaver, who says our ammunition is not in proper shape and says that we ought to have two hours' supply, when we have only three-quarters of an hour's supply. Even Gen. Crozier says that we must have an hour's supply, and yet the committee has provided in this bill only 1½ per cent additional ammunition. This munificent largesse will raise the amount of seacoast ammunition on hand from 73 per cent to 74½ per cent of one hour's battle supply for all guns.

I find in a statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] which appears in the Evening Star of December 4, 1914, the following:

"The fortification subcommittee since I have been chairman," said Mr. SHERLEY, in speaking of the matter to-day, "has never held back a single dollar on essentials. It has appropriated every dollar asked for guns and battle necessities."

Is the gentleman from Kentucky correctly quoted?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Kentucky was not fully quoted.

Mr. GARDNER. All right; I will go on. I read:

"We have not appropriated everything asked for, as we thought it best to get the forts and the guns and the ammunition, and then pay attention to frills."

Is he now correctly quoted?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, without proposing to be cross-questioned as to the reported interview, I desire to say that I have given no written interview to any newspaper at any time. Newspaper men have frequently asked me about matters, and in a general conversation they have gathered impressions and have then printed what they thought was my viewpoint.

Mr. GARDNER. Was this matter which went out to the press on December 10—which went, for example, to the Boston papers—authorized by the gentleman or not at the time of his speech to the Southern Society in New York?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know what the matter is that the gentleman refers to.

Mr. GARDNER. Well, does the gentleman say that his committee has given everything the department has asked for in the way of ammunition?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will give, when we reach that item, the estimates that have been asked and the amounts that have been given.

Mr. GARDNER. Then, in default of a contradiction from the gentleman, I will say that the committee has done nothing of the sort so far as concerns the appropriation for seacoast ammunition last year. I hold in my hand the fortification bill for last year. In that bill I find that the committee fixed the appropriation for seacoast ammunition at \$140,000. I find in the estimates last year that Secretary Garrison asked for \$400,000 for seacoast ammunition. I notice that Gen. Crozier, on page 195 of this year's hearings, testified that heretofore the seacoast-ammunition estimates had been made too small. But he said: "In some cases they were made under instructions, and in some cases they were made in hopelessness of getting any greater amount than was estimated for." The result is that the ammunition for the seacoast guns is still less than three-quarters of an hour's supply.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, if he desires to be correct, the gentleman will find that the ammunition for the guns is not 72 per cent, but in many caliber guns is 100 per cent, and in some over 100.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, let us be accurate about that. On page 198 of the hearings can be found the exact statement. Mind you, in some cases, it is over 100 per cent if you transfer all your ammunition from one coast to another, but it makes a lot of difference which coast you are transferring to and which coast you strip. If you transfer all your ammunition from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast, where there are so many less guns, of course there will be over 100 per cent of ammunition for the limited number of guns on the Pacific coast. But suppose the war is on the Atlantic coast. Suppose that all the ammunition provided for the Pacific guns is brought across the continent to supplement the supply for the Atlantic guns. Will those Atlantic guns have their full two hours' supply as contemplated by the Taft board? By no means. Turn to page 198 of the hearings. Here is the evidence of the Chief of Coast Artillery.

Gen. WEAVER. If they were shipped from one coast to the other, the percentage for a two hours' supply would be as follows: For 3-inch guns, 42 per cent; for 4.7-inch guns, 74 per cent; for 5-inch guns, 96 per cent; for 6-inch guns, 42 per cent; for 8-inch guns, 55 per cent; for 10-inch guns, 70 per cent; for 12-inch guns, 71 per cent; and for 12-inch mortars, 34 per cent.

Mr. SHERLEY. That would depend upon what coast they were shipped from?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is, if shipped from the Pacific to the Atlantic?

Gen. WEAVER. Shipped from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. SHERLEY. If, on the other hand, they were shipped from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, you would have more than 100 per cent in some instances?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes; I can work that out if you desire it. If shipped from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast the percentages would be as I have just read them.

Now, it is true, as the gentleman says, that if we ship all the ammunition from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, that then for a great many different kinds of guns we shall have more than 100 per cent of the amount requisite for two hours' battle supply.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Surely.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will find, without regard to transferring from coast to coast, on the basis of an hour's supply for all the guns, Gen. Crozier testified as follows.

Mr. GARDNER. What page, please?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know. I will give it in a moment. I am reading from a part of it—the part that is available. Gen. Crozier says:

The allowance for the 3-inch (15-pounder) guns is 200 rounds per gun, and we have 70 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 4-inch guns is 150 rounds per gun, and we have 132 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 4.72-inch guns is 150 rounds per gun, and we have 85 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 5-inch guns is 125 rounds, and we have 118 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 6-inch gun is 125 rounds and we have 76 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 8-inch guns is 90 rounds per gun and we have 91 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 10-inch guns is 60 rounds per gun, and we have 101 per cent on hand.

The allowance for the 12-inch guns is 45 rounds per gun, and we have 110 per cent of projectiles on hand, but only 85 per cent of powder. The ammunition for the 14 and 16 inch guns is still under manufacture, for the 14-inch guns being 40 rounds, and the 16-inch 35 rounds. The allowance for the 12-inch mortars is 50 rounds, and we have 46 per cent on hand.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, does the gentleman dispute the fact that we have only 73 per cent in value of the ammunition on hand for one hour's battle supply for all our seacoast guns?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not of guns and mortars; but the gentleman stated that we had only 73 per cent of ammunition for the guns, and in that he was in error.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, let us see. I asked these questions of Gen. Weaver, because the Chief of Staff in his annual report said exactly what I have quoted.

Here is what he said:

According to the report of the Chief of Coast Artillery the amount of ammunition now available and provided for by appropriations is equal to about 73 per cent of this requirement for the guns and 50 per cent for the mortars.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] interrogated Gen. Weaver, but the exact situation did not develop. Here is the colloquy. It can be found on page 197 of the hearings:

Mr. CALDER. Gen. Weaver, I want to ask you some more of Mr. GARDNER's questions. I think you have already answered them in a somewhat different form. "Is it a fact that we have only one-half of the mortar ammunition recommended as a minimum by the National Coast Defense Board?"

Gen. WEAVER. For continental United States; yes.

Mr. CALDER. Is it a fact that we have only three-quarters, or 73 per cent, of the coast gun ammunition recommended as a minimum by the National Coast Defense Board?

Gen. WEAVER. No. I answered that question just a moment ago.

Mr. CALDER. What is the percentage we have?

Gen. WEAVER. The percentage is 73 per cent on a money value basis, and then it is approximately—

Mr. SHERLEY (interposing). You do not mean that, General. It is 73 per cent on money valuation of both guns and mortars?

Gen. WEAVER. Yes.

I am correct in saying that the Chief of Staff quotes the Chief of Coast Artillery to the effect that the ammunition supply is 73 per cent for the guns alone, without regard to the mortars. It is quite possible that the Chief of Staff may have made an inexact quotation. But supposing for the sake of argument that it is guns and mortars, not guns alone, which are meant, that does not substantially change the situation. When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] comments on what I am saying I hope he will refer to page 198 of the hearings and take up Gen. Weaver's evidence, wherein we are told what would happen if an attempt were made to shift ammunition from the least threatened coast to the most threatened coast.

THE SEACOAST GUNS.

Let us take up the question of guns. In continental United States there is no gun bigger than a 12-inch gun mounted in any of our fortifications. There are four unmounted 14-inch guns on the Pacific coast. The Panama Canal has two 14-inch guns mounted and eight more which are going to be mounted. Corregidor Island and the Hawaiian Islands have some 14-inch guns, and there is a 12-year old, 16-inch gun that has been lying in the sand up at Sandy Hook which is going down to Panama when they can get a carriage built for it. It is a gun of the old-fashioned, short type, not the type recommended for Cape Henry, for instance.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understood the gentleman to say there were no 14-inch guns mounted in this country.

Mr. GARDNER. In continental United States there are none mounted.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I thought we had some 14-inch guns in the fortifications on Puget Sound.

Mr. GARDNER. I understand from the Secretary of War that the only guns of that caliber in continental United States are the four guns which are to be mounted on the Pacific coast. My impression is that they are destined for the fortifications of San Diego. Undoubtedly the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] can correct me if I am wrong about that.

Mr. CALDER. I think they are for San Pedro.

Mr. GARDNER. Then they are for San Pedro, which is a newer fortification. At all events there are no other 14-inch guns mounted, unmounted, or projected in that part of the United States which is situated in North America.

Mr. TAGGART. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. TAGGART. In this European war that has been in progress nearly seven months there has not been a coast-defense gun fired, except perhaps in the Dardanelles, has there?

Mr. GARDNER. Very likely not; but if the gentleman is going to discuss general principles, I hope he will discuss them with somebody else. I want to get down to the facts.

As I have said, there is nothing larger than a 12-inch gun yet mounted in continental United States. Seventy-six out of 105 of those 12-inch guns are mounted on Crozier disappearing carriages and their range is only 13,000 yards. Think of that. On the barbette carriage, on which 29 are mounted, the range is 18,000 yards. How do these 12-inch guns compare with the naval guns mounted on the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *War Spite*

and other modern superdreadnaughts? Those naval 15-inch 45-caliber guns have a range of 21,000 yards, which is 8,000 yards, or over 4 miles, farther than the range of the best guns we have in the United States mounted on the Crozier disappearing carriage. Of our 12-inch guns 29 are mounted on barbette carriages, now considered out of fashion. Twelve-inch guns so mounted have a range of about 18,000 yards, according to the Secretary of War's letter to the Speaker January 15, 1915. But 76 of our 12-inch guns are mounted on Crozier's disappearing carriage. Their range, according to the Secretary, is no more than 13,000 yards.

"Ah, but," says Gen. Crozier, "we will alter those guns by cocking them up in the air so that we will increase the range to 20,000 yards." Very possibly. We used to have a gun that was cocked up at 45° that had a very much longer range still. In fact, the British at one time had guns which were cocked up at 45° and their range was over 45,000 yards. You can get a tremendous range if you cock your gun up high in the air. But how does that help things?

What else must be done to improve the range of our 12-inch guns? Gen. Crozier's annual report and the table on page 206 of the hearings show that you must reduce the weight of the projectile from 1,070 pounds to 700 pounds. What is the weight of the projectile which the enemy's 15-inch guns fire? About a ton—1,950 pounds, to be accurate. That is the projectile with which the attack is armed. Can we meet the situation with made-over 12-inch guns, which fire projectiles of only 700 pounds weight?

After all, these contemplated changes are not as yet made, and the testimony of Gen. Crozier himself was to the effect that it will take a year to make them. Meanwhile gentlemen are talking as if the horizon was a protection to us. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] told us the other day that a colonel in the Army had told him that an admiral in the Navy had said that these long ranges were not worthy of any consideration because ships at 20,000 yards distance were well below the horizon.

The fact is that a man about 82 feet above sea level can find the range for an object 21,000 yards away. The top of the masts on our superdreadnaughts is usually about 130 feet above sea level.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman intend to tell us anything about the probability of vessels at sea attacking any of our coast forts successfully?

Mr. GARDNER. I am coming to that. I have read some lectures in which it was asserted that in modern warfare fleets would never go against land fortifications. I was inclined to be convinced until I saw in the paper the day before yesterday that the French and English fleet has, as a matter of fact, attacked the forts at the Dardanelles.

Mr. MOORE. It has been suggested that a city like New York might not be altogether impregnable.

Mr. GARDNER. Attacking forts and coast defenses is one thing, and bombarding a city like New York is an entirely different one. It might sometimes be the case that a ship could not attack fortifications and yet could lie out of range and bombard the city which those fortifications were supposed to protect. In case of war, I doubt whether there would be a direct attack on the New York forts themselves, because I do not see why an admiral with any brains should take that risk, when all he had to do would be to land troops on the coast near by and attack the forts in the rear.

Although under present conditions a foreign admiral might not try to reduce the fortifications of New York, nevertheless I am convinced that to-day the *Queen Elizabeth* and vessels of her type could lie in safety out of range and bombard part of the city.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the gentleman's opinion as to the feasibility of landing troops on the ocean coast itself?

Mr. GARDNER. I do not know, except that Admiral Fletcher, on December 9, 1914, testified before the Committee on Naval Affairs that a foreign enemy could land almost anywhere that he had a mind to. I am not an expert. That is the sort of thing which we ought to have looked into by a commission.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are there any instances which will sustain the statement of Admiral Fletcher?

Mr. GARDNER. He mentioned our landing near Santiago.

Mr. MOORE. With that view, of what use are the fortifications at Pearl Harbor? Why could not they land on the shore as well?

Mr. GARDNER. Many people have doubts whether the defenses of Pearl Harbor are sufficient.

To revert to this matter of the proposed alteration of the 12-inch guns. I am going to read from an article in the North American Review, written by one of the younger Coast Artillery officers. I am going to read from Lieut. Thompson's article, page 263, North American Review, for February, 1915. Here is what he says:

Should those in charge of gun construction determine to make the army 12-inch guns longer in range, with consequential loss of life to the gun and the great expense involved, it is doubtful whether our present carriages could withstand the strain caused by the additional powder charge and the higher angle of elevation required to make them compare in range with the latest 13, 14, and 15 inch guns of the maritime powers.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is you can not make over one of our 12-inch guns so as to be as good as the modern naval 15-inch guns, and it is folly to lull ourselves into the belief that the thing can be done.

Here is the report of the Breckinridge Board, December 19, 1914, and here is the last sentence:

The general policy with reference to seacoast defense should be to have an armament there emplaced of greater range and power than any which could be brought against it.

Instead of our armament having greater range and power it has less range and power. That is all there is to it.

WHY WERE THE ESTIMATES SO LOW?

The committee is contending that it has given the Army everything which the Secretary of War has asked for. It is true that Secretary Garrison has been given pretty nearly everything that he has asked for so far as the fortifications bill is concerned. May I call your attention to his reasons for asking for so little? He says, in the first place, that these estimates on which this bill was based were made out for the most part last March and submitted to him last spring. He had acted on practically all of them by June, long before the European war began. The Secretary says, on page 42 of the hearings:

If I were to make up the estimates now I should ask for more.

Again, on page 44, he says:

I do not feel now, in view of the state of the public revenue and in view of the state of the public necessities, that I should materially increase these estimates, notwithstanding the fact, as I say, that there has always existed a necessity for more precaution than we have ever taken in this country.

Even if the committee is giving the Secretary all he asked for in the estimates, that does not mean that the Army is being given what the officers have estimated as requisite. Take, for instance, the appropriation for field artillery in this bill. The Secretary's estimate was \$1,160,000 and the committee appropriated that amount. But that amount was very much less than Gen. Crozier estimated as necessary. He asked the Secretary of War to request the appropriation of \$3,000,000 for field artillery in this bill and \$3,000,000 for field artillery in the Army appropriation bill.

Turn to page 172 of the hearings and you will find that my assertion is true. Here is Gen. Crozier's testimony as to the amount of the Field Artillery estimates which he submitted to the Secretary of War:

Mr. CALDER. What I mean by that is, in presenting your case to the Secretary of War are these the amounts you asked for?

Gen. CROZIER. \$3,000,000 on each bill.

That is what the general asked the Secretary of War to approve. During the economy drought before the war in Europe broke out the estimate was cut to \$1,160,000.

SIXTEEN-INCH GUNS NEEDED.

I call the attention of the committee to the fact that before long we must construct fortifications at Cape Henry. Is the War Department asking for those "just-as-good" 12-inch guns? It is not. Gen. Weaver has asked for 16-inch 50-caliber guns, and that is to be the standard of the future. Listen to this passage from the general's report as Chief of Coast Artillery:

In view of the fact that foreign warships of the latest design are to carry guns larger than 14 inches in caliber and of the highest ballistic power, and in view of the fact that if the defenses of Cape Henry were subjected to a naval attack it would be possible for a naval enemy to bring many battleships carrying 8 to 12 large-caliber guns per ship and to concentrate their fire on the Cape Henry fortifications * * * the Chief of Coast Artillery has recommended that the type gun for the Cape Henry fortifications be a 16-inch 50-caliber gun.

If these 12-inch guns which they are going to make into long-range guns by cocking them up a little higher and reducing the weight of the projectile—if these guns will then be all that Gen. Crozier's fancy paints them, then why is Gen. Weaver asking for 16-inch guns down at Cape Henry, and why are we installing 14-inch guns on the Panama Canal, at Corregidor Island, and in Honolulu?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Can the gentleman inform the committee what was the relative range of the forts in the island of Cuba as compared to the range of the American battleships? For instance, the range of the guns in Moro Castle at Habana and at San Juan, P. R., and at Santiago de Cuba?

Mr. GARDNER. Nobody ever tested that. I happened to be at Porto Rico. We landed far away from the forts. Nobody would have been fool enough to land under the guns of the San Juan fortifications when we could land anywhere we wished. As a matter of fact we landed at Ponce and Guyama and Guanica. It was the same way in Cuba. They had plenty of places to land. They picked out Daiquiri and effected a landing there.

Mr. KAHN. But there was an attack on the Moros?

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, pshaw! They bombarded a mule or something or other down there.

Mr. KAHN. That was at Cardenas.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, at Cardenas.

THE FORTIFICATIONS.

I read from the report made in 1906 by the National Coast Defense Board, which was appointed January 31, 1905:

Strategically, Chesapeake Bay is, as it always has been, of the very first importance. With the entrance, as it is now, unfortified, a hostile fleet, should it gain control of the sea, can establish, without getting under the fire of a single gun, a base on its shores, pass in and out at pleasure, have access to large quantities of valuable supplies of all kinds, and the operation of the great trunk railway lines crossing the head of the bay.

That is what the National Coast Defense Board said nine years ago. That is the way the board pictured the military deficiencies of the sea approaches to Baltimore and Washington. Yet not one spadeful of earth has been turned to remedy that condition; not one spadeful. We have purchased some land at Cape Henry at the mouth of the bay, but further than that we have not gone. However, the ordnance and engineer officers recently presented to Secretary Garrison an estimate of the amount of money necessary to go ahead with the plans for constructing the defenses at Cape Henry. That estimate amounted to \$1,750,000 in round numbers. Principally on account of the condition of the Treasury, Secretary Garrison declined to submit this sum to Congress as a supplemental estimate. I admit that it would have been useless to recommend a part of that sum. Unless he recommended the whole million and three-quarters dollars, it was no use recommending anything at all, or so the Army officers said. What the Secretary ought to have done was to recommend every cent of that estimate. In December of 1912, Gen. Leonard Wood, in response to a question by Mr. SHERLEY, in the hearings on the fortifications bill on page 13, December 11, 1912, testified as follows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I read from the hearings:

Mr. SHERLEY. It has been testified heretofore that so far as the continental United States was concerned we were not only adequately fortified, but in many instances overfortified?

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. And you concur in that general proposition?

Gen. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mind you, it was before the big 15-inch guns were mounted on foreign vessels that Gen. Wood gave that testimony. Moreover, he had no sooner said "Yes, sir," than he gave a long list of works yet to be undertaken in order to complete our necessary fortifications. The whole context shows that what Gen. Wood meant was that in certain places we had more guns than were necessary. He did not go into the question of the quality or range of the guns. The table which he presented that very day shows that he could not have meant that we had all the fortifications that were necessary. I have called attention to Gen. Wood's words because it is on that evidence that our opponents in part rely to confute our claim that more fortifications are imperative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand the gentleman from New York desires to yield some time to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. CALDER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky expect to have several speeches?

Mr. SHERLEY. I doubt whether there will be more than one or two short speeches on this side, with the exception of my own. May I ask the Chair what the status of the time now is?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 hours and 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHERLEY. How much has the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 1 hour and 33 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I can use a little time.

Mr. CALDER. I will use some time if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Just as the gentleman pleases.

Mr. CALDER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration makes appropriations for the fortification of our continental coasts and our insular possessions. It also carries appropriations for field artillery, for our present organization and for reserve purposes, and for ammunition, supplies, and reserves for coast and field guns of all classes.

The committee recommends the expenditure during the next fiscal year of a little more than \$6,000,000 for these purposes, the same being about \$130,000 less than the amount of the estimates. I shall support the committee in its recommendation, because I am of the opinion that there is nothing in the present situation warranting an increase above the estimates. I am not, however, fully persuaded that the War Department would not have been justified in increasing its estimates for field artillery in view of its apparently relatively increased importance as a factor of modern war.

This is the last of the supply bills to be passed by the House dealing with military and war establishments, and I congratulate the House on not having been swept off its feet by the clamor and insistence of those who cite the present unfortunate conditions in Europe as a reason or excuse for greatly increased military and war expenditures.

Much as we desire peace, we all realize the necessity of reasonable preparation for war, and we only differ in our view as to what constitutes reasonable preparation under present conditions. I am one of those who believe that while we should not ignore prevailing conditions in the world and while we should take any extra precautions and make any extra provision within reason which that situation may clearly and unmistakably demand, we should by our policy make it very clear that we do not propose to allow the conditions of war abroad to hurry or stampede us into the adoption of a policy of vast and exhaustive military preparation. It is rather our duty in the present crisis to accentuate our position as a nonmilitary peace-loving power.

Whatever may be one's opinion as to the kind of a military establishment we ought to maintain, or the amount of money we should spend upon it, it can not be truthfully said we have been niggardly in our appropriations, having appropriated for those purposes for the years 1905 to 1916, inclusive, \$2,754,653.652.17, as follows:

Army (1905-1916)	\$1,056,992,311.88
Armories and arsenals (1905-1914)	5,573,725.00
Military posts (1905-1914)	19,108,127.50
Deficiency acts (military establishment, 1905-1914)	24,338,943.67
Naval Establishment (1905-1916)	1,557,063,534.31
Military Academy (1905-1916)	15,838,755.91
Fortifications (1905-1916)	75,738,253.90

Grand total..... 2,754,653,652.17

Army appropriation acts, fiscal years 1905-1916.

1905	\$77,070,300.88
1906	70,396,631.64
1907	71,817,165.08
1908	78,634,582.75
1909	95,382,247.61
1910	101,195,883.34
1911	95,440,567.55
1912	93,374,755.97
1913	90,958,712.98
1914	94,266,145.51
1915	94,241,145.51
1916 (as reported to House)	94,214,173.06

Grand total..... 1,056,992,311.88

Naval Establishment appropriations, 1905-1916.

1905 (58-3)	\$115,420,997.75
1906 (59-1)	104,508,719.88
1907 (59-2)	99,693,298.32
1908 (60-1)	129,974,371.95
1909 (60-2)	139,216,545.02
1910 (61-2)	133,555,552.88
1911 (61-3)	127,026,100.00
1912 (62-2)	123,024,783.27
1913 (62-3)	142,071,725.92
1914 (63-1)	147,212,935.88
1915 (63-2)	145,868,716.61
1916 (63-3) (as reported)	148,589,786.88

Grand total..... 1,557,063,534.31

Military Academy appropriation acts, fiscal years 1905-1916.

1905	\$973,947.26
1906	673,713.38
1907	1,664,707.67
1908	1,929,703.42
1909	845,634.87
1910	2,531,521.33
1911	1,856,249.87
1912	1,163,424.07
1913	1,064,668.26
1914	1,099,302.87

Total..... 13,802,873.00

1915	\$997, 899. 54
1916 (as reported to House)	1, 037, 983. 37
Grand total	15, 838, 755. 91
<i>Fortification appropriation acts, 1905-1916.</i>	
1905	\$7, 518, 192. 00
1906	6, 747, 893. 00
1907	5, 053, 993. 00
1908	6, 898, 011. 00
1909	9, 316, 745. 00
1910	8, 170, 111. 00
1911	5, 617, 200. 00
1912	5, 473, 707. 00
1913	4, 036, 235. 00
1914	5, 218, 250. 00
Total	64, 050, 337. 00
1915	5, 627, 700. 00
1916	6, 060, 216. 90
Grand total	75, 738, 253. 90

In detail our appropriation for these purposes, exclusive of armories and arsenals, military posts, and for various military purposes in deficiency acts totaling about \$49,000,000 for the period, have been as follows:

Army, Navy, Military Academy, and fortifications appropriations for each year from 1905 to 1916, inclusive (exclusive of sundry civil bill appropriations for armories and arsenals and military posts and deficiency appropriations for Military Establishment amounting to \$49,219,786.71).

1905	\$200, 983, 437. 89
1906	182, 326, 957. 85
1907	178, 230, 164. 07
1908	217, 436, 660. 12
1909	244, 761, 167. 50
1910	245, 453, 068. 55
1911	229, 940, 117. 42
1912	223, 936, 670. 31
1913	238, 131, 342. 16
1914	247, 796, 634. 26
1915	246, 735, 461. 66
1916 (as reported to House)	249, 902, 160. 21

If we are as unprepared as some would have us believe, it certainly is not because we have not appropriated large sums of money.

BAITING OF JAPAN.

Speaking of preparation for the possibility of misunderstandings with foreign powers, I am reminded that there is one kind of preparation which those who most clamor for vast military and naval establishments seem to hold in light esteem, though in my opinion it is the best of all insurance against and the most effective preventive of war: I refer to the maintenance of open-mindedness and good will, of candor and consideration, of the confidence which begets confidence, in our attitude, not only as a Nation but also as individuals, toward the nations and the peoples of the world.

The Constitution of the United States limits treason to acts of war against the United States or the adherence to and the giving of aid and comfort to its enemies. If it is treason in law to make war against one's country, is it not treason in essence to increase the liability of war by constantly reiterating the possibility and prophesying the probability of war? If it is treason in law to give aid and comfort to the enemies of one's country, is it not treason in substance to constantly proclaim that certain other nations and peoples, who have never given the slightest evidence of hostile intent, are inevitably destined and covertly inclined to engage us in hostilities?

Some of those who, for reasons best known to themselves, indulge in what I am constrained to consider treasonable baiting of foreign peoples make a specialty of continually proclaiming the probability or the certainty, as they put it, of an armed struggle some time in the future, near or remote, between our country and Japan. Such people are fortunately few in number, but what they lack in number they make up in clamor and persistency. In my humble opinion these declarations and those who make them can not be too severely condemned. If their assertion had any basis, their reiteration could serve no good purpose. If a conflict between Japan and this country some time in the future, near or remote, were as inevitable as these alarmists would have us believe, it could not be avoided, and therefore no good purpose would be served by harrowing up men's souls in advance in regard to them.

If the theory of these bellicose and bloodthirsty gentlemen has been that they were performing a public service by attempting to rush the country into feverish and gigantic preparations for the conflict they prophesy, they ought by this time to have become convinced that their efforts and their labors are in vain, for the people have steadily refused to take them seriously or to approve the ambitious plans of military preparation which they seek to promote by alarms which would be shriekingly ridiculous if they were not profoundly mischievous.

We have had, and no doubt will continue to have, problems and questions with the Government and people of Japan, as we

have with other Governments and peoples, which are more or less trying and vexatious. But no questions have arisen, none are likely to arise, that can not and will not be settled peacefully by the exercise of a reasonable amount of patience and good judgment by the people and the Governments of the two nations. We have no plans or ambitions for the future—so far as we know Japan has none—which will afford any reason or excuse for a clash of interests that can not be readily adjusted through diplomatic channels. Therefore I fail to see the slightest reason or excuse for the periodical fulminations of the gentlemen who afflict their nightmares on a long-suffering public.

Our people have been so little disturbed by, and have paid so little attention to, these outbreaks of warning against the "yellow peril" that we might all of us treat them with the amused tolerance with which they are ordinarily received if it were not for the fact that this sort of agitation, kept up long enough and reiterated with sufficient frequency, must eventually have some effect, and that harmful and mischievous to the last degree. I have known evil-minded or empty-headed people to get an entire neighborhood by the ears by the wicked or silly magnifying of trifling disagreements or by inflaming latent prejudices. Little Johnnie Jones and Billy Smith, naturally and usually friendly, may by the frequent interference of fools or busybodies be gradually led to magnify their minor differences and disagreements into causes for belligerence and permanent estrangement. The best of neighbors will eventually quarrel if each is sufficiently urged that a quarrel between them is inevitable.

As it is with individuals and communities, so it is with nations. Constant suggestion, frequent assertion, everlasting reiteration by those able to reach the public ear that two nations have aspirations and ambitions, plans and purposes which are irreconcilable and will not admit of adjustment by peaceful means, will eventually create a state of mind among both peoples in which the most trifling incident may light the spark of suspicion thus engendered and embroil nations which have no real inclination, reason, or even excuse for hostility in bloody and disastrous conflicts. It is this possible lamentable effect of the recital of these nightmares of apprehension, these groundless forebodings of hostilities, which take them out of the category of harmless vaporings, to be tolerated with good nature, and render them menaces to the public weal, which, while beyond the reach of statute, should receive condign punishment at the bar of public opinion.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ATTITUDE TOWARD MEXICO.

Fortunately these utterances have been wholly on individual responsibility. The attitude of our Government, so far as I am advised, has been frank, friendly, and correct. The same can not, I regret to say, be said in regard to the attitude of our Government under this administration toward our neighboring Republic on the south, relative to which I wish to submit a few observations.

On the 27th of this month one year will have elapsed since I made my first speech in the House criticizing the attitude of the administration toward the Government and the people of Mexico. At that time the administration had had a little more than a year in which to determine upon, advance, and carry forward its policy toward our neighboring Republic. That speech, temperate though it was, was roundly assailed on the other side of the Chamber as an impertinent attempt to call into question the acts of the President in exercising his constitutional authority in dealing with foreign affairs; and even on this side there were gentlemen who, hoping that by some chance or other the unhappy situation in Mexico might mend, doubted the wisdom of discussing the matter at that particular juncture. Later in the session and at various times, particularly on March 3, April 20, April 27, May 21, July 14 and 15, I addressed myself to various phases of our relations with and policy toward Mexico and the warring factions there.

During the period covered by these addresses it became increasingly apparent to all careful observers and thoughtful students of affairs in Mexico, and the acts and the attitude of our administration toward them, that things were going from bad to worse down there and that the administration's policy and lack of policy were becoming more and more untenable and indefensible. And yet through it all so generous is the attitude of the American people, and properly so, toward the dealings of their Government with foreign powers, so hazy was the public mind with regard to the real situation in Mexico, and the actual facts with regard to our relations to them and to the various factions, and above all so keen was the public hope that in some way or other peace and order would be restored without the necessity of extensive, expensive, or prolonged acts of intervention, that the average citizen was inclined to with-

hold censure of acts and policies that he could not and did not wholly approve.

This was the frame of the public mind when, just before the general elections last fall, with the overthrow of Huerta there came a temporary brief cessation of hostilities on a large scale, followed by the prompt issuance of the Democratic campaign book, with its fervent and flamboyant praise and eulogy of the President for the alleged restoration of peace and order in Mexico. Whether it was due to a promise to try to be good until after our election, or to a satiety of murder and plunder, on the part of those who had been the recipients of the administration's favors and the beneficiaries of its policy, that brought about a brief welcome respite from the more pronounced and flagrant atrocities, I do not know, but, as was inevitable, this break in the saturnalia of bloodletting and rapine was only temporary.

In the last few months the scenes and characters of the tragedy being enacted in Mexico have shifted and changed with bewildering rapidity. Presidents, generalissimos, and first chiefs have appeared in the spot light for a brief moment, to be rudely jostled and displaced by other aspiring candidates for brief and questionable notoriety and authority. Meanwhile the play has been constantly enlivened by a kaleidoscopic succession of scenes of major and minor rapine, pillage, and outrage. Above and over all has echoed and resounded the orchestra accompaniment of infantry and artillery fire and the repeated volleyings of murderous firing squads.

At least four, and nobody knows how many more, individuals are now claiming, as President, first chief, or commander, primacy in this drama of anarchy and chaos, while innumerable lesser villains are valiantly contributing their share to complete the picture of desolation and despair. With industry paralyzed, commerce suspended, homes desolated, cities despoiled, ranches ruined, fields uncultivated, her citizenship plundered, hunted, and terrorized, Mexico lies bleeding in the midst of anarchy, her people menaced by pestilence and facing starvation.

These deplorable conditions in Mexico are at last universally recognized and admitted, and more and more the part which our policy has played in producing them is being realized. From an attitude of a patient tolerance with the blunders of the administration's policy our people have gradually passed through a period of apology for the administration's policy to one of clear and well-nigh universal disapproval and criticism of it. None seek to defend, but few to apologize for what has been done and left undone in our dealings with Mexico, while from every quarter are heard expressions of regret, criticism, or condemnation.

In this state of affairs I am not particularly disposed to further emphasize or accentuate the now well-nigh universal disapproval of the administration's policy toward Mexico. I am not even disposed to assume the attitude of one who with the best of reason might, in the light of the present situation, very properly say, "I told you so." My only object in discussing the Mexican situation at this time is to point out and accentuate the fact that present conditions in Mexico, so far as the attitude of our administration has affected and produced them, is not due to any fluke or mischance of hard luck or adverse fortune, but is the inevitable result and consequence of a policy which was unwise, un-American, vicious, and indefensible from the start. The evil consequences which have followed have merely come as a logical and inevitable effect.

In the address which I made on February 27 last on this subject I expressed regret that my duty, as I saw and understood it, constrained me to criticize the administration in a matter relating to our foreign intercourse and relations. I stated that I was only persuaded to do so because I felt that the policy which the administration was pursuing did not afford "any substantial ground of hope or element of promise of improvement or solution of the conditions and problems" which confronted us in Mexico. I further stated that I was "persuaded that the acts and attitude of our Government have had the effect of prolonging and extending the lamentable condition of appalling disorder and distress which prevail in Mexico; that the continuation of our present policy, or lack of policy, tends to retard indefinitely the establishment of orderly conditions and constitutional government." I further stated on that occasion that as bad as conditions were in Mexico they would, "in my opinion, be infinitely worse if the aims and objects apparently desired by our administration shall be accomplished," and I expressed the belief that under the policy that we were following "the reign of rape and rapine, of plunder and murder that have desolated northern Mexico and set it back a generation in civilization and development will spread all over that fair land."

In a former discussion of the Mexican situation I expressed the opinion that the inevitable outcome in Mexico, owing largely to the attitude and acts of our Government, would be that the country, after being successively devastated by the armies of the different factions, would become the prey of a number of rival leaders, each of whom would, in his own sphere, when not engaged in fighting the others, busy himself with exhausting, for his individual benefit and that of his immediate followers, the accumulations and the resources of the particular territory over which he held brutal and despotic sway. All these things have come true, and yet I am not a prophet or a son of a prophet. I was merely stating in advance the inevitable effect of causes our policy helped set in motion and advanced in the accomplishment of their logical effect. I have no desire to weary the House with a repetition of what I have heretofore said with regard to our policy and its probable result, and I shall only review the matter briefly for the purpose of refreshing your recollection as to certain features of the administration's policies, and again point out their fatal error, in order to emphasize the fact that what has happened is only what could have been reasonably expected.

In an address which I delivered on April 3 last in Philadelphia, before the American Association of Political and Social Science, and which appears on page 350 of the Appendix to the Record of last session, I reviewed the historic policy of our Government in dealing with foreign powers, and particularly with other American States, under conditions similar to those which then confronted this administration. I then called attention to the fact that it had ever been our policy in dealing with these nations, while avoiding scrupulously the espousal of the cause of any one faction as against another, to endeavor to maintain correct diplomatic relations with the de facto Government without regard to its character or its personnel.

The very first important act of this administration in its relations "with those exercising authority in Mexico" constituted a complete reversal of our time-honored policy and constituted an affront to the dignity of Mexico as an independent sovereignty. In his demands upon and his communications with "those exercising authority in Mexico" the President early erred in three important particulars—first, in declining to establish regular official relations with the de facto Government in Mexico and in treating with those whom he described as "exercising authority in Mexico" irregularly and personally; second, in demanding the removal of the head of the de facto Government; third, in a variety of ways, officially and unofficially, directly and indirectly, openly and covertly, aiding and encouraging a faction of the forces operating against the de facto Government. The first of these errors substituted personal for official management in our relations with Mexico; the second challenged Mexico's independence and sovereignty; the third was an act of indirect intervention which culminated in war—a little war, it is true, but a war, nevertheless.

It does not excuse our inexcusable policy that it was in all probability drifted into rather than definitely determined upon. Rumor has it that at the beginning of the administration it was assumed, if not determined, in the Department of State that after a sufficient time had elapsed to emphasize the abhorrence and the disapproval of our Government and people of the assassinations which immediately followed the establishment of the Huerta government our Government would, accepting the fact and the situation, recognize the Huerta régime as the de facto authority in Mexico. It was realized and understood that this recognition, if too long delayed, might lead to acts or expressions by those "exercising authority in Mexico" which would embarrass us in extending that recognition.

The situation was one, therefore, demanding close attention and careful and diplomatic treatment. But the crucial moment, so it is said, approached, arrived, and passed while the Secretary of State filled lecture engagements. Observations were made, so it is said, by the head of the de facto government in Mexico and opinions were expressed by him relative to our acts and policy toward that government which did not set well with our Chief Executive, and then and there was determined the purely personal policy of hostility against the head of the de facto government, of interference with the affairs of Mexico, and of indirect intervention in behalf of one of the warring factions.

What has happened is the inevitable, the logical result of the attitude thus assumed, an attitude of insult to the sovereignty of Mexico, an attitude disintegrating and trouble breeding in its effect. Our refusal to deal directly and officially with the de facto government, on the theory that Mexico was independent and sovereign, precludes the possibility of our recognizing, now or in the future, any de facto government that does not subject itself to

or meet the preposterous condition that we, or, rather, our President, shall judge the constitutional character of the de facto government. This policy and attitude deprive any government established in Mexico of that recognition by foreign powers which is a helpful, if not an essential, aid to the establishment of peace and order so long as there are any aspiring chieftains able to retain control of any considerable territory or population in Mexico.

Not only has the policy thus pursued retarded the establishment of peace, but it has rendered us well-nigh helpless in the protection of the persons and property of our citizens. Our policy has likewise rendered us impotent and ineffectual in fulfilling our duties and responsibilities toward other nations and their citizens, duties devolving upon us as Mexico's nearest and most powerful neighbor and solemnly assumed by us under the Monroe doctrine. Hundreds of Americans have lost their lives, thousands have been insulted, despoiled, and outraged, and the property of Americans running into the hundreds of millions has been destroyed or rendered valueless. The nationals of other countries, more particularly those of Spain, who have relied upon us because we assumed responsibility for them, have suffered outrage, indignity, and death. Foreign property, especially that of Spaniards, has been confiscated, looted, or destroyed. We stand before the bar of public opinion of the world condemned for our failure to meet and live up to responsibilities we have ourselves assumed.

The only answer or excuse made or offered on this floor or elsewhere for our failure and dereliction has been in the false claim that the President has preserved peace with Mexico. The President has not maintained peace between the United States and Mexico. He inaugurated and carried on a war which but for the weakness of the de facto government in Mexico would have been long and bloody and which, except for the splendid gallantry and heroism of our soldiers and sailors, was as inglorious as it was brief.

The oft-reiterated declaration on this floor and elsewhere that the President preserved peace with Mexico while the Republicans were clamoring for war is as silly as it is untrue. No one on this floor, no one in a position of responsibility anywhere, so far as I know, has desired or demanded war with Mexico. I certainly have not. I did not approve the little war we had. I have never believed that intervention was necessary or desirable. We might have avoided the loss of \$15,000,000 and a score of gallant lives at Vera Cruz or we might have made that sacrifice of some value by holding or extending our control.

There was a way to measurably protect our people and their property in Mexico, and to have reasonably, probably satisfactorily, fulfilled our obligations to other countries and their citizens without intervention and without further expense than that of holding as we have done a considerable body of troops on the Mexican border.

Had we followed our time-honored policy and in due and proper course recognized the Huerta government as the de facto government in Mexico, or merely recognized that government as the government in control of that portion of Mexico, and made no demands upon it other than the protection of the lives and property of our citizens and those of other nations we should have had the good will of that government and the people friendly to it, and the lives and property of our citizens and other foreigners would have been respected and protected. As a matter of fact, Americans and other foreigners were protected in their persons and in their property by that government in spite of our indefensible attitude toward it.

If, further, we had remained neutral toward the warring factions in northern Mexico, had treated them without fear and without favor and laid upon them the single injunction and condition that in their conflict with the Huerta government they must see to it that the persons of our citizens and of other foreigners were respected and their property protected as far as possible under the conditions of war which existed, had we made it clear to Villa and Carranza that any failure to afford this respect and protection would be swiftly followed by the advance of our forces across the border, and that failure to punish promptly outrage or destruction, which might occur in spite of efforts to prevent it, would be followed by a swift and effective blow, we would, in my opinion, have had little reason for complaint.

One time and another the President has said some very extraordinary things about Mexico and his policy in dealing with that country and people, but the most remarkable of all his utterances on the subject are contained in the very peculiar speech which he made at Indianapolis on Jackson Day. Among other things the President said:

I hold it as a fundamental principle, and so do you, that every people has the right to determine its own form of government.

It is curious that the President had forgotten or overlooked this fundamental principle when he assumed the right to tell the people of Mexico through John Lind what kind of a government they should have. The claim the President then made that he, and not the people of Mexico, had the right to say what sort of a government they should have and who should be at the head of it, was the basis and the beginning of the administration's blunders and errors in Mexico.

The President further uttered the very obvious truth, "The country is theirs. The government is theirs." And then, as though to valiantly ward off some evil-minded intermeddler, he declared with emphasis "and so far as my influence goes while I am President nobody shall interfere with them." Nobody has been interfering with them but the President, and he has interfered with them and with their affairs directly and indirectly and has brought to the support of that interference the Army, the Navy, and all the moral and political influences of a great nation. Probably what the President meant was that he did not intend to have anyone interfere with Mexico but himself. That is evident enough. Persistent rumor has it that our interests in the Panama Canal were put in jeopardy, if not surrendered, in order that the President might have a free hand to interfere with Mexico in just the way he desired.

Perhaps the most extraordinary statement which the President made at Indianapolis was, "If I am strong I am ashamed to bully the weak." This expression leads me to hope that the President is regretting the way he bullied the Huerta government and the people of Mexico who were favorable to that government. Finally, the President said that he thought the Mexicans should have just as long as they wanted for blood-letting and to settle their affairs. To all of which, with certain reservations, we say, "Amen." But why did not the President think about that and take that view of the matter 18 months ago, when he was setting himself up as a dictator over Mexican affairs? Extraordinary as it may seem, the one feature of the situation which is primarily our affair, with regard to which it is our right and our duty to have much to say and to say it with emphasis, the President entirely ignored in his Indianapolis speech. He made no reference whatever to our right and our duty to demand and enforce the protection of our citizens and the citizens of other nations, responsibility for whom we had assumed.

The people of Mexico have a right to the sort of government they desire. They have the right to have at the head of that government whoever they please or whoever they shall tolerate. They have the right to quarrel among themselves as much as they please. These rights which the President now asserts, as though some one else were denying them, he himself denied. On the other hand, we have a right, it is our duty, to demand and secure protection for the persons and property of those for whom we are responsible, but we have failed utterly so to do. For the first time in a large and important affair of our foreign relations the policy adopted and followed has been one of continuous blunders, of profound and lamentable error and bad judgment. We have neither protected our own people nor the people of other nations we were pledged to protect. Every American in Mexico has been disappointed and humiliated by our acts and attitude. Foreign Governments can not help feeling contempt for our failure to perform our duty toward their citizens. If we have a friend or well-wisher left among all the warring factions in Mexico, he has not been heard from. We have finally excluded ourselves in a large measure from even the uncertain and unofficial relationships our Government for a long time maintained with the various factions in Mexico, and are therefore more than ever helpless to extend protection or exercise influence amid the reign of chaos and anarchy. This, then, is the sorry outcome, the sad and lamentable effect, of the policy which our administration and its supporters have so proudly and hopefully proclaimed. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, 35 years ago I went out from a small denominational college in South Carolina. There are other institutions of higher literary standard, but nowhere on this earth is there an institution where the moral and religious atmosphere is better. On the occasion of my graduation from that institution the subject of my discourse was the advocacy of an international court that would try differences between nations as courts in all civilized countries adjust differences between individuals. I live in the hope that the day will come when there will be a great court for all the nations of the earth, presided over by men of such distinguished ability and character that its judgments will be respected and enforced just as the decrees and judgments of the courts of

civilized countries are to-day. I am sorry that at this time the great newspapers and magazines of this country have assumed the attitude they have. If the great metropolitan dailies and the magazines would devote one-half of the space to preaching peace on earth and a higher civilization and Christianity among men that they now devote to trying to scare the American people and the American Congress into great appropriations for the Army and Navy they would render a distinct service to human kind. [Applause.] I looked over one of the great papers this morning and there were three separate articles intended to inflame the minds of the people and to excite the Congress to make larger appropriations.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are making progress. The Congress has not been swept off its feet to the extent some gentlemen hoped, and while our progress to a higher civilization and a higher enlightenment is not as rapid as some of us would like to see it, we are still making progress. There was a time in the history of Massachusetts when the people believed in witches. There was a time when the people lay awake at night studying about plans and methods to protect themselves against the witches, because it was said that the witches could come through the keyholes and get into rooms in all kinds of ways. We have departed from such superstitions as that, and we look back in amazement now that an intelligent people should ever have believed in such nonsense. I can remember when the dueling code was quite the thing. Do gentlemen around me now remember that at one time in our history it was common for public men, when they felt that their dignity and their honor had been assailed, to insist that there was but one way to defend that honor, and that way was to meet their opponent at 10 or 20 paces and shoot it out? We are getting away from that sort of false sense of honor. We are getting away from that sort of civilization. We are getting away from that sort of barbarism; and we live in the hope that the day will come when our people will look back in absolute amazement and astonishment at such arguments as have been made on this floor about war and the preparation for war. I want to enshrine in this RECORD my idea of civilization for the benefit of my children and other children who shall come after. It is such speeches as have been made in this House and on the stump, when printed in the newspapers, that are intended to stir people, to excite the people, and they may do incalculable harm. They remind me of telling a child ghost stories in the dark. If you want to make a child perfectly miserable, sit down in the dark hours of the night and tell that child ghost stories, and then tell the child to go to a neighbor's house past a graveyard, or go upstairs and go to bed in the dark.

And these wild speeches that have been made in Congress and out of Congress, as I said a moment ago, are intended to have, and do have, just such an effect on timid people as the telling of ghost stories in the dark has on children. If there ever were a time in the history of this Republic when men ought to be talking peace, and men ought to be talking in favor of reducing these great appropriations for guns and ships, now is the time. [Applause.]

I believe when the war broke out in Europe last August and involved all the great warlike nations, the people were prepared to believe that every argument upon which we had based our previous appropriations for the Army and for the Navy had been proved to be false. We have been making these appropriations ever since I have been in Congress—14 years—upon the basis that preparedness insured peace. The war in Europe has demonstrated what some of us have believed all the time, that that was not true. It is no more true with nations than it is with individuals. A man who carries revolvers in his pocket is the man that gets into shooting scrapes, and not the fellow who does not. It is the nation that prepares for war that gets into war, and not the nations that do not, and that was clearly demonstrated by the war in Europe. The people would have reached that conclusion. Instantly there was such an agitation set up in this country, and such a propaganda as we have never had in your day or mine, in favor of increasing the appropriations. We are utterly unprepared, according to these wild statements that have been made. Then, if we are utterly unprepared, we have wasted untold hundreds of millions in the last 20 years. There is one of two things true, either the Army and the Navy men have squandered the money or have not used it in the proper way, because we have certainly appropriated money enough to put us in a state of defense.

I do not think this country is in any danger of war. It is possible that any man in our presence may be assassinated between this House and his home to-night, but it is so absolutely improbable that such a thing will happen that no man has little enough sense to sit here and worry about it until he

gets ready to start for home. So it is in regard to this country getting into war. It is possible, but it is so remotely improbable that nobody need to bother in thinking about it. Certainly not at this time, when all the great powers of the earth have all they can take care of on their hands now. Who is going to fight you now? Who is going to land in New York and actually take charge of the multimillionaires and lay a ransom of \$5,000,000,000 upon them? I saw a statement like that printed in a morning paper, taken from some article, book, or magazine written by one of these alarmists. There is no sense in that sort of talk. There are plenty of people in New York who are poor in this world's goods but who have the physical strength to take hold of one of these multimillionaires any day upon the street and rob him; but they do not do it, because this is a law-abiding country. And so no nation is going to try to land an army on our shores. What would they do it for?

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make this statement, relating somewhat to the bill now under consideration, because I have been hearing speeches ever since this session of Congress began that are so far from my idea of what our duty is in this emergency that I wanted to state what I believe ought to be done. I believe the great American Republic ought to take the lead of all the nations of the world and undertake to establish a higher civilization and a higher Christianity, undertake to establish a great court to settle the differences between the nations as differences between men are settled. [Applause.] I stand for peace in all the world and peace among all mankind. I may be in the minority now, but the doctrine which I preach will stand the test of analysis; it will stand before any tribunal where reason instead of passion and ignorance and superstition controls.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. And it will stand in the court in the great hereafter when we all appear there.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. Would he submit to that court the question of the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Oh, I do not care to discuss the Monroe doctrine. The men who advocated the Monroe doctrine no more preached the kind of doctrine that the gentleman from Massachusetts is preaching than the Savior of the world preached the doctrine that we now hear on this floor. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN].

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JOHN FITCH.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a subject which is of special interest to Connecticut, and particularly to the first congressional district, which I have the honor to represent. In the interests of historical accuracy there is a strong sentiment in Connecticut in favor of according justice to an inventor whose genius gave mankind one of our most valuable inventions. I refer to John Fitch, a native of Connecticut.

The records compiled by Admiral Bunce Section, Navy League of the United States, Hartford, Conn., and historical works which I have at hand, prove clearly that the discovery, invention, and successful application of steam propulsion of vessels through water—the first in all history—belongs in all justice, honor, and of right to John Fitch, a native of Windsor (now South Windsor), State of Connecticut. Fitch's steamboat invention dates back to April, 1785. His practical drawings and models which showed the screw propeller, as well as paddles, were exhibited the same year to the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, Pa.

FITCH IN 1786.

In 1786, upon the petition of Fitch, New Jersey granted him sole and exclusive rights in her navigable waters for a period of 14 years for his steamboat invention. This original petition of Fitch, which was lost for many years, has been found recently—1914—by Adj. Gen. Wilbur F. Sadler, of New Jersey, and photographic copy of same forwarded to Connecticut.

In 1787 four other States, viz, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and New York granted Fitch similar rights in their navigable waters for a period of 14 years for his steamboat invention. These grants to Fitch were made 20 years before Robert Fulton launched his first steamboat, the *Clermont*, on the Hudson River, in 1807.

In 1789 the United States National Government was formed, taking over the control of the navigable waters of the several States.

In 1791 the National Government granted Fitch letters patent for his steamboat invention for a period of 14 years.

In 1796 Fitch also constructed a steamboat out of a ship's yawl, moved by a screw propeller, upon the Collect Pond, New York City.

In 1798, nine years after control of navigable waters of New York had passed over to the National Government and seven years after the National Government had granted Fitch letters patent for his steamboat invention, Chancellor Robert R. Livingston petitioned the then Legislature of New York to repeal the act of 1787 which granted Fitch rights in the navigable waters of his State and to grant him, Livingston, similar rights in the navigable waters of New York. This extraordinary petition of Livingston for a limited period of 20 years was granted, notwithstanding New York had no navigable rights to grant to anybody, they having been passed over to the National Government in 1789.

In 1803, five years later, Livingston again petitioned the then Legislature of New York to extend these so-called rights in the navigable waters of this State to Robert Fulton.

NO "CLERMONT" TILL 1807.

Up to this date, 1803, Livingston's and Fulton's experiments in steam propulsion of vessels through water "had proved fruitless," and they asked this legislature to grant them two years more of time to determine the practicability of their experiments, which was granted, conditioned, however, that "if successful" these experiments should be submitted to a commission. Fulton's *Clermont* was not launched on the Hudson River until 1807.

In 1808 the then Legislature of New York granted Livingston and Fulton confiscatory penalties.

These so-called "rights" were exercised by Livingston and Fulton up to 1812, when they brought suit against Van Ingen and others for infringement of these "rights," and were sustained by the New York courts.

Some time after 1812 these "rights" were assigned to John R. Livingston, and he assigned them to Aaron Ogden, of New Jersey.

Ogden made memorial and petition to the then Legislature of New York of 1814, which was referred to a select committee to hear the controversy between John Fitch and Livingston and Fulton on priority of invention pertaining to steamboats, when claimants appeared by counsel, and on March 8, 1814, this committee reported that the Livingston and Fulton steamboats were in substance the invention of John Fitch, patented to him in 1791 by the National Government of the United States.

Ogden then brought suit against Thomas Gibbons for infringement of these so-called "rights" obtained from Livingston and Fulton, and he—Ogden—was sustained by the New York courts, but which on appeal by Gibbons went to the Supreme Court of the United States and was heard at the February term, 1824. Daniel Webster appeared for the appellant, Gibbons. The United States Supreme Court reversed and annulled all these legislative grants made by New York to Livingston and Fulton, sustaining Mr. Webster's argument, that these legislative grants created a monopoly to Livingston and Fulton with "confiscatory penalties," which were hostile to all the other citizens of New York, hostile to the citizens of all the other States, and hostile to the sovereignty of the United States. This ended the Livingston and Fulton monopoly.

FULTON'S OWN ADMISSIONS.

In addition to the above, Fulton's own declarations are conclusive. In his letter to Lord Stanhope November, 1793, Fulton says:

In June, 1793, I began the experiments on the steamships. My first design was to imitate the spring in the tail of a salmon. For this purpose I supposed a large bow to be wound up by the steam engine and the collected force attached to the end of a paddle, as in No. 1, let off, would urge the vessel forward."

It was this identical year—1793—that Fulton borrowed from Mr. Vail, our consul at L'Orient, France, Fitch's drawings and specifications of the steamboat Fitch had been running on the Delaware River three, four, and five years before 1793, carrying passengers and making 7 to 8 miles an hour. Such was the beginning of Fulton's crude experiments in steam propulsion of vessels through water—by imitating the spring in the tail of a salmon, by use of a steam engine to wind up a bow attached to the end of a paddle, let off, would urge the vessel forward. And the ending came when in 1814 the select committee reported to the New York Legislature that the Fulton and Livingston steamboats were in substance the invention of John Fitch, patented to him in 1791 by the National Government of the United States.

It seems incredible that the promoters of the Hudson-Fulton celebration, New York City, 1900, should have been ignorant of the facts of record in their own State, and especially that

the select committee appointed by the New York Legislature of 1814 on petition of Aaron Ogden, of New Jersey, reported that Livingston and Fulton's steamboats were in substance the invention of John Fitch, patented to him by our National Government in 1791, and, further, that Fulton himself never claimed priority for steamboat invention, and still further that all the grants made by the Legislatures of the State of New York to Livingston and Fulton were reversed and annulled by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1824.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has now 1 hour and 57 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not now see anyone present on the floor to whom I have offered time. If the gentleman from New York desires to yield some time, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. CALDER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire at the outset to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose only of printing a paper prepared some years ago by the Hon. S. D. Fess, of Ohio, giving the inside history of the writing of Washington's Farewell Address.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing in the RECORD the document indicated by him? Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly approach any discussion of military matters with a great deal of diffidence. While military matters have always been attractive to me as to many another citizen and civilian, and probably have received more side study from me than any other subject in which I have ever been engaged, yet my own limitations are so vast that I do not feel like hazarding anything like judgment or expressing very much in the way of an opinion. Therefore I would not on this occasion offer any remarks at all did I not feel it necessary that something be said and that some expression be given to some features of our national defense that it seems never will be allowed to get out. I have no words whatever in the way of criticism of the committee that presents this bill, nor have I any words of criticism respecting the character of hearings which they had. I hope I make that emphatic. But I do think that at this particular time it is unfortunate that there was not had before the committee certain Army and, perhaps, Navy men of great military attainments, to give expression to their viewpoint on these matters of fundamental importance to the Nation. The committee had before it Gen. Weaver, the commanding officer of the Coast Artillery, and a splendid officer, Gen. Crozier, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, an officer of the very highest attainments, character, and honor, and the Secretary of War; and that is all. Those were the only ones of military training that were permitted to say a word on our Nation's defenses. It was only, as I assume, and I think I assume correctly, by reason of his battering-ram persistence that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] got before the committee and participated somewhat in the hearings.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman surely does not think it was on account of not naming officers that should be summoned that this omission to summon officers occurred? The gentleman does not suppose that I failed to furnish this committee with the names of officers that I would like to have summoned, as I did in the other committees?

Mr. MILLER. I am not certain of the facts, and yet it was my impression certainly, that, knowing the gentleman as I do, he made every possible effort—

Mr. GARDNER. I did.

Mr. MILLER (continuing). To have these men summoned and permitted to appear before this committee.

Mr. GARDNER. And I asked to have before this committee the Chief of Staff, Gen. Wood.

Mr. MILLER. Therefore, without posing as a military expert, but simply giving to the House the opinions that these military experts have given me, I offer the few remarks that I do on this occasion.

The first thing I want to speak about is the type of gun carriage with which our coast-defense guns are now mounted. I do not for a moment offer myself in the arena of discussion, often acrimonious, that has been had in years past over the Buffington-Crozier type of disappearing-gun carriage, but I do offer this, that the present type of disappearing-gun carriage in use generally in our coast fortifications is not adapted, and

can not be adapted, to large guns of long range. For certain very well-established reasons, not to mention the complexity of their structure, which is a very incidental feature after all, this type of gun carriage is not adapted to guns of large caliber. By reason of the mechanical nature of their structure—and their essential structure—they can not be made reasonably to cover what is known as all-around fire. I believe there are four or five guns, perhaps a few more, that have been constructed of that kind in our fortifications, but the number is infinitesimally small.

Now, I observe the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] smiles. I do not doubt that he smiles. He thinks what I am saying is foolishness. I do not blame him at all, for the reason that he has obtained his knowledge and his information and his opinions from the same channels that have ever led in times past and still lead to the House of Representatives from the Military Establishment. Some of us on the outside have journeyed a little afield and have endeavored to get the information from the men who are serving the guns, from the men who are charged with the responsibility of standing up and shooting and being shot at if the shock of battle ever comes to our land.

In his own hearing Col. Winslow, not a military man, but an engineering officer of high rank, has stated, as the gentleman from Kentucky will recall, that the Crozier-Buffington disappearing gun carriage is not adapted, and his experience and observation and mechanical judgment go to show that it can not be well adapted, to all-around gunfire. Any attempt to construct that kind of an emplacement involves an expenditure of money that runs into enormous figures and practically destroys the safety zone for the men serving the guns. There is not a gun, so far as I know, mounted on our coast fortifications and now ready for use of a greater caliber than 12 inches. Recently, when the big guns of foreign navies were at work, the people of our Nation were aroused over the fact that our coast fortifications were not equipped with guns the equal in caliber and range of guns that might be brought to bear against them—guns that are in foreign navies of the world. I have no doubt but that that idea was accentuated when we read recently of the battle in the North Sea, where the British ship *Lion*, as I recall, or *Tiger*—one or the other—actually made effective hits at a range of 17,000 yards, while the maximum range of our 12-inch guns in our coast fortifications is only 14,000 yards with a projectile such as they call their heaviest or maximum size. From 12,000 to 14,000 yards was the reasonable average maximum distance those guns could be fired with effect.

Recognizing this, we find the recommendation made—and the subcommittee saw fit to act upon it—to make a 15 or 16 inch gun out of the 12-inch gun by pointing it up a little higher in the air. It is not proposed, so far as I understand, to increase the powder charge. If anything, they are going to make the projectile a little lighter in weight, so that it is not that they intend to make a heavier projectile.

Now, everybody knows that the striking force of any object depends upon the speed with which it goes and its weight. Is there any child in America old enough to have studied mathematics at all who thinks that a projectile of a given weight, fired with the same amount of ammunition, when it has traveled 20,000 yards will strike with the same effect and force that it would strike had it been fired at 12,000 yards? Everybody knows that as you increase the distance of the moving projectile you decrease its striking power. Therefore, its velocity being less and the weight of the projectile the same, the concussion is very much reduced.

I was quite amused to note some of the cocksure smugness of certain conversations or statements in the hearings, when it was said that, while we might have some disadvantage in pointing these guns up in the air, yet when the bullet or projectile came down it might strike, instead of on the side of the ship, on the top, and therefore have some of the force of a mortar—the vaporing thought of a man reaching for an excuse! You never can make a 15-inch gun out of a 12-inch gun, and everybody knows that.

I think I know one reason why guns of a larger caliber have not been made in the last two or three years, although we are making some of 14 inch, have mounted some in the insular possessions, and have some ready for the United States, while, in addition, it is proposed now to construct our main coast batteries of guns having 16-inch caliber. I believe it was Gen. Weaver, in the hearings, who said that in his opinion and that of the board that considered the matter recently, guns should be constructed for coast defenses of 16-inch caliber. Evidently none of them thought you could point a 12-inch gun a little higher in the air and thus make a 14, a 15, or a 16 inch gun out of it.

Now, I am not here advocating that we take down all of the 12-inch guns that we have and put in their place 14, 15, and

16 inch guns. Not at all. I am simply advocating that hereafter, in line with what Gen. Weaver has suggested, the guns that we build and hereafter mount shall be of larger caliber; and such guns, I do not believe, can be placed successfully upon a disappearing-gun carriage.

And I can give you in just a moment or two my reasons for that belief. Several years ago, when I visited one of the fortresses of the United States, like anyone would be, I was interested in the big guns. I had a captain of a battery explain them to me somewhat in detail. He was a most efficient officer. I will say to you that this fortification is the strongest in continental United States. I was admiring, with American enthusiasm, the disappearing-gun carriage, and I asked him if it were not superior to all of the other gun carriages in the world, if any other nation had anything like that which we possessed, if this did not give us a superior position over any of the other nations of the world; and he laughed. He said that for a gun no greater than 10 inches it was fine, but that for 12 inches it was far inferior to the barbette type. I thought perhaps he was an isolated individual; that perhaps he was a crank; that possibly he did not express the opinion of his brother officers. So from that day until the present, every time I have visited a fort—and I have visited a great many in the United States and outside in our insular possessions—I have sought out the Coast Artillery officers, and I have asked the question, "For 12-inch and larger guns is the disappearing-gun carriage that we now have better or as good as the barbette or turret type?" I want to say to you that of all the men I have asked I have never found a man who failed to say that the present disappearing-gun carriage is inferior to the barbette or the turret type. They told me that when it comes to the matter of safety to the man, which is one of the important features advocated by those who favor this type of gun carriage, when you come to a gun of the size of 12 inches or greater, the distance the gun is compelled to move back into the emplacement is so great that the safety space is materially lessened, and the protection is probably no greater, if it is as great as in the barbette type.

But to my mind this is the greatest feature of all: They tell me that for a 12-inch gun or gun of larger size the disappearing type is of comparatively slow fire. I was surprised when I heard that, because I had heard it said that one of the great things in favor of the disappearing-gun carriage was that the recoil of the discharge of the gun sent it back right where the ammunition was and that the shell could be rammed in, and by the time the gun got back up it was ready for firing. Now, I have read the essays of several of the Army officers comparing the two types of carriage. There are elements of time saved by both systems, and some of the officers say one about balances the other for the smaller guns. But we are confronted with this fact: The highest speed with which a 12-inch gun has been fired in the history of our fortifications is a little less than two shots a minute—about one and three-quarters a minute—and the maximum speed that is fixed by the Chief of Artillery in the hearings as a basis for the number of rounds for a two-hour engagement is 45 seconds, or two shots in a minute and a half. We are confronted with the fact that in all of the navies of the world, so far as I know, the 12-inch guns are being fired from six to ten times a minute. Therefore one gun with the barbette carriage, with the proper methods of loading it, would be equal to about three of the disappearing type.

I want to confess and admit that in many of the tests that are now had it is shown that by our present system of loading in the barbette type the speed is probably not much greater, if it is as great as with the disappearing carriage. But there has been no change for 30 years in the method of elevating the ammunition to the gun in the barbette type. Every other nation in the world has, by mechanical devices, revolutionized that system, and we can do it ourselves in one month's time if we will but set our minds to it.

I found one thing more. I found that military men in the Coast Artillery Service lamented the fact that the muzzle velocity of our coast artillery has been lowered from 2,550 feet per second, as it was a few years ago, to 2,250 feet per second, as it is now. This is in spite of the fact that all the other nations in the world, in their coast artillery and in their navies, have increased the muzzle velocity of their guns, until now in England it is 3,000 feet per second and in Germany 3,080 feet per second, while we, in the grand old United States of America, have dropped down to 2,250. Food for thought! I inquired why this was. Not all answered. Most said they did not know, but those who did answer said that in their judgment our Ordnance Department was afraid of the disappearing-gun carriage, and that the muzzle velocity had been lowered to save the carriage.

Now, if some of these things are true, if any of them are true, the subject ought to be and ought to have been investigated. These younger men who are actively in the work of manning these fortifications, who are engaged in the actual work of handling these guns, ought to have an opportunity to express their views, which opportunity has not been given in this Congress, and so far as I know has not been given for a great many years past, and the only reason why I say they ought to have been given an opportunity at this session is because the subject is now a live one, more alive perhaps than it has been for a long period of time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said, and I agree with him with reference to the Buffington-Crozier carriage; but I was under the impression that the reason why the muzzle velocity had been lowered was because of the fact that the greater the muzzle velocity the greater the amount of erosion of the rifling of the gun, and that it had been found that the high velocity had resulted in shortening the life of the gun, bringing about its early destruction—that is, bringing about such inaccuracy that after a certain number of rounds it was of no practical value.

Mr. MILLER. I am not certain as to that. I will say, however, that I have heard it stated by the officers in the Coast Artillery Corps that they had been told that the reason why the decrease had been made in the muzzle velocity was because of the erosion, but that they did not believe that was the primary reason.

I think, however, it is natural to assume, and we must admit, that there would be some decrease in the erosion by decreasing the speed at which the projectile is fired. Even a nonmilitary man like myself can recognize that. But if that is the reason, why have all the other nations of the world increased the muzzle velocity of their big cannon? The answer is that efficiency is the supreme test, and apparently we have journeyed far backward in efficiency while other nations have advanced.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it not a fact that it was Gen. Crozier himself who testified in the hearings that the guns would wear out in much less than 300 shots if they had a higher velocity than 2,250 feet; was it not Gen. Crozier defending his own pieces?

Mr. MILLER. I think that is entirely true. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON], a short time ago when the gentleman from Massachusetts was speaking, asked him something in reference to mortars, and the gentleman from Massachusetts replied, giving some account of the making of mortars and what the mortar was expected to do; and in response to a further question, he said that in Hawaii it had been found necessary to at least suggest some land defense to protect Pearl Harbor. Now, I am very frank to say that I do not think much of anybody who talks out of school; I do not know whether I am talking out of school or not. I desired to have these matters submitted to the subcommittee in charge of this bill, but for some reason or other opportunity was not given, and this is the only chance I have got, and I am going to use it now.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Did the gentleman from Minnesota himself ask to appear before our committee?

Mr. MILLER. Not myself. I asked that military men might be summoned and their testimony had. I would not presume to appear before any committee and give them suggestions in matters military.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman suggested once to me about an artillery officer stationed in Manila, but with that exception did he ever make a request to summon any other officer?

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman is not quite accurate; I suggested that on two occasions. The gentleman may not recall both times. I suggested to him that there were matters of grave importance connected with the insular defenses, and the man who had charge of the construction was in the War College, and I thought he ought to be summoned before the committee and his testimony had. The gentleman from Kentucky on this occasion said that he would consider it. Thereafter when I thought the hearings were about to begin I went over on the Democratic side and made the suggestion again. Now, I am willing to say that the gentleman from Kentucky may have been preoccupied—he may have had something on his mind—but on account of the treatment I then received I thought it was not wise to make the request any further.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is aware that I said a few moments ago that I was not conscious of any such treatment.

Mr. MILLER. That is true.

Mr. SHERLEY. I say now that my impression is that I spoke about the matter having been sent to the War Department and having been considered there.

Mr. MILLER. I am willing to admit that the gentleman might have been preoccupied, but the reception was not such that I thought it wise to pursue the subject further.

Now, I want to say something about Hawaii. I was in Hawaii in the hour when the Japanese scare was on, and it was a scare, whether rightfully or wrongfully it does not matter. Brig. Gen. Funston had charge of the island as commanding officer. He was very kind to me. He discussed with me in detail the predicament he was in. He was not looking for Japanese troops or the troops of any other nation to land in front of the big guns, in front of the batteries of mortars, twelve 14-inch guns that protected Honolulu and Pearl Harbor, but he was looking for forces that might land anywhere all around the island. He did not want greater guns to keep off the fleet, but land defenses to protect the seacoast fortifications in the rear. Those big guns could beat back the mighty ships of any nation, but the soldiers of any nation could land all around the island, take the batteries from the rear, and then do with the cities as they pleased.

The gentleman's committee recognized that finally, because in the bill of a year ago they carried an appropriation, I think, of nearly \$600,000 to complete these very fortifications which that situation had disclosed as being so vitally essential. That gap has been closed, but it is not the only gap. We have them everywhere. We have them in the Philippines and we have them everywhere in continental United States.

The trouble is with the coast fortifications today—and the gentleman's committee is not to blame for it; the trouble is that they can stand off a fleet; they can protect a city from a fleet sailing up and bombarding it; but they can not protect the city from the landing forces, and every military officer in the coast-fortification service knows that. They have admitted frankly that a reasonably small number of troops can land here and there, almost anywhere, put the fort out of business, and then the ships can march gallantly up and bombard the city; and the city of New York stands in that position to-day. So does every other city of the land. Every gun points to the sea—not a gun points to the land—and our guns are not of the all-around fire type. New York feels snug and safe behind Fort Hancock. But any nation, provided it can dispose of our fleet, can then land troops on the Jersey coast, take Hancock in reverse, and march on to New York, with their ships booming along. A fort of the type we have serves to-day only to make certain that an enemy will not land at that particular spot and that our fleet can use that harbor as a rendezvous.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman says that he feels that the coast defenses are adequate to protect all cities from bombardment, and that that is a different function from protecting from land forces elsewhere. Is the gentleman aware that there was a discussion of that matter which does not appear in the hearings?

Mr. MILLER. I am not.

Mr. GARDNER. Is the gentleman sure that the defenses of Boston, New York, and San Francisco are sufficient to protect the cities as they have grown?

Mr. MILLER. I am not sure of that. I merely assumed that for purposes of discussion. One thing more. I hope the gentleman from San Francisco is here. I saw him here a moment ago. Talking with Gen. Funston about the protection from land attack, he said that he had charge of San Francisco and its fortifications when the great fleet came around on its journey about the world.

This great fleet, the mightiest ever assembled beneath the American flag, was then commanded by one of our heroes of the practical, fighting type. He had served in two wars and in every water of the globe. When his fleet reached San Francisco, in conversation with me, Gen. Funston said:

I showed him the fortifications defending the harbor of San Francisco, and I said, "Admiral, are they not splendid?" He replied, "Fine; they can beat off the mightiest fleet of any nation in the world; but I can land 10,000 men down here near Monterey and I can capture your city within 24 hours"; and I said, "I know you can."

The solution of that, it seems to me, as has been properly expressed by many military men, is that we need a larger personnel in our coast defenses, and that is the emphatic thing stated by Gen. Weaver in the hearings. While we are pretty long on guns at the present we are miserably, contemptibly short of men, and you can not man fortifications anywhere without men. We never will have a real system of coast de-

fense until we have sufficient men to protect the forts, in some degree at least, from land attack. I have but a moment or two left, and I want to speak of the fortifications in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I would like to yield, but I fear I have not the time. How much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I will try to complete what I have to say and then I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman if I have any time. I want to say a word about the fortifications in the Philippine Islands, all of which I visited and all of which I studied as well as a layman can study such problems. They are certainly a magnificent series of forts. We have spent upward of twelve or thirteen millions of dollars in their construction. The city of Manila lies 30 miles in at the end of the bay, and a series of islands close the mouth to the bay, Corregidor, Caballo, El Fraile, and Carabao. Corregidor is a great fortress. It is 565 feet high, with several magnificent batteries. I recall distinctly when I was at the highest battery I looked over across the water to Meriveles and I said to the man who had constructed the fortifications, "What is to prevent an enemy from landing and placing cannon on that hill yonder and commanding your forts?" He said, "Nothing on earth, and for two years I have reported showing the weakness of this position, urging that something be done to protect us against a land attack." Afterwards I met a distinguished military man and I put that to him and he laughed at it and said, "Why, that hill is so high and it is so difficult to mount guns that you could not get a gun up there that would command Corregidor." So they worked out a war problem there about a year ago. I hope I am not telling any military secrets that ought to be kept dark, but I am going to speak out in meeting. I know what happened. They settled the controversy. An expedition went out. The fort was given an aeroplane, and a mine planter, amply equipped with mines, was made ready. War was declared at a certain hour. The mine planter went to lay the mines. The expedition had gone out to sea. No man knew when it would come back or where it would land.

The mine-planting machine had not one-third of its mines laid before it was physically put out of business. How? By a gun fired from the region of that same hill. They trained the Corregidor guns upon it, but they could not locate the gun, and they never did locate it, but one day was hardly over before every gun in the commanding battery of Corregidor was theoretically silenced. Gentlemen who testified before this subcommittee and others for three years have said that could not be done. The man building the fort said it could be done, and it was done at the first test.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CALDER. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. MILLER. So much for Corregidor. I would like to say a word about the others. I can say only a word about Carabao. Upon Carabao is mounted 14-inch guns, with a battery for 12-inch rifled mortars in the center. That island is located up close to the shore. You can stand on the shore and you can look right down in, as you can look down into a hopper, and see your four mortars, and there is nothing on earth to prevent men armed with nothing more than rifles—for the distance is about a thousand yards—landing on the coast yonder and shooting off every gunner you put in the place. That has been reported against constantly and turned down by the board. Furthermore, a series of ridges starting from the shore lead back with constantly increasing height, permitting reverse fire from the opposite side. There is nothing on earth to prevent an enemy from landing a few miles up the coast and coming down those ravines, you do not know which one, and by reverse fire putting out of operation those entire fortifications. That has been reported against vehemently, patriotically, earnestly. What we need in the Philippine Islands is what you finally did in Hawaii—some land protection for your seacoast fortifications.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. When the gentleman says those things have been reported against, just what does he mean?

Mr. MILLER. I mean that the men in charge of construction at Corregidor Island have sent in reports stating those conditions and recommending certain changes to remedy the defects, and their recommendations have not received favorable attention.

Mr. GARDNER. To whom have those reports gone?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know.

Mr. GARDNER. To somebody in the War Department?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. And they have received no attention?

Mr. MILLER. They have not been acted upon.

Mr. GARDNER. That is your understanding?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman does not mean to give the opinion that they have not been acted upon. The gentleman means to say that they have not been agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. I do not know—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. I think it is fair to say this, that I was informed on high authority that the recommendations had been considered by the board, whatever that is, and that they had been turned down. One word further relative to Corregidor. That is supposed to represent our highest attainment in fort building beneath the American flag. As I say, the highest battery on Corregidor Island, and they are all nearly of the same height, is about 565 feet. The hill which I mentioned a while ago, as I recollect, is 973 feet high.

The distance from Corregidor to this hill is 7 miles, easy rifle shot, and I think it fair to say that the board, in turning down the recommendation of these men in actual operative construction of the fortifications, turned it down because they did not think it possible to get a gun upon that hill of a caliber sufficient to carry 7 miles. They now, by reason of the experience of the recent war, know that that easily can be done. So I assume—and, I think, I correctly assume—they would change their attitude now upon that question. Back of this 973-foot hill, however, is another one, about 10 miles distant from Corregidor, that is over 1,400 feet high. In the region of these hills for many miles each way are mountains, valleys, and gulches, all heavily wooded. It is a simple engineering feat to perfect and complete these fortifications. There must be protection on each wing. Our center is strong, but our wings are open. There must be—and any military man who examines it now will admit—fortifications at the Meriveles end protecting there, and fortifications beyond Carabao, at the other end, to protect at that point. You then have a chain of forts and fortifications that will be amply sufficient. Until you have that protection you have not anything more than a chain where two links are lamentably weak. Now, I apprehend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] will say that it is expected to change this condition with respect to Corregidor, a change the Army Board has been convinced is necessary to make by reason of the maneuvers I have mentioned, as they are going to send over four mortars—12-inch mortars—and mount them at Caballo, an island lying just beyond Corregidor which already contains some very heavy guns. These guns are not to control the sea, but to control the region in Meriveles. Well, now, the distance from Caballo to the hill I have mentioned is 7 miles. There is not a mortar they are going to send of the four that can fire accurately that distance. There are mortars in the Army that can do it, but they are not the ones that are being sent over. And even if that were true, a group of mortars would be a miserably small protection against the whole region of mountains and valleys and gulches that extend from the hills I have mentioned miles and miles both east and west. The protection must be on the land, the protection which was finally vouchsafed to Hawaii. You finally had to provide them on the land there, and if you listen to wisdom you will provide them in the Philippines.

One word more relative to Corregidor defenses. For some reason I never could find out our military authorities here sent to equip Corregidor some 20 howitzers and some 20 old siege guns. These are all the short, fat-bellied type that were considered some gun in the days of our grandfathers, but which for a generation have been valuable only to decorate county courthouses and parade grounds. We laughed at the archaic, antiquated, ineffectual guns we found the Spaniards had placed on Corregidor, and yet we have gone them one step further in lunacy by placing these popguns in the forts. The fire of these guns is so slow, so mournfully slow, that one modern gun is equal to about 10 of them in point of number of shots and immeasurably superior in point of efficiency. The worst of it is that these guns have to be manned. A single modern gun crew can fire as many shots as a dozen crews working at these ancient guns. The cost of maintaining these gun crews for a single year is more, much more, than the cost of a new battery of modern guns. Verily, America, where is your boasted genius?

Gentlemen, that is all I desire to say. [Applause.] I yield back to the gentleman any time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and 52 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk about the fortifications bill this afternoon. I am heartily in sympathy with the building up of our fortifications, as, according to my notion, that is the best way to defend our country, and I am always for the establishment of a defense. I happen to serve on the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and have served for some time, and in my service there I have learned something about our Military Establishment. I do not believe that it is in the bad condition that it is pictured here by many of our friends. On the other hand, I am not one of those who are silly enough to believe that it needs no improvement. My idea is that it should be safely and sanely built up on practical American lines, on lines of general defense. While I am not going to talk about that general subject this afternoon, I am going to talk about a kindred subject. About 18 months ago I introduced a bill in this House to remedy a very important defect in our system of national defense. In the Revolutionary War, in the War of 1812, in the Mexican War, in the Civil War, and in the Spanish War our great trouble as a Nation was in the lack of officers. We had to train our officers for the most part in all of those wars. Those officers were frequently made of men with no previous military training. They were trained at an immense cost of money and life, because we all recognize that it takes time to train an officer in the Army.

Gen. Washington, in one of his addresses—and I refer to it particularly to-day because of the day it is—urged Congress to prepare a better system of training officers, and West Point was created at that time, when our country was a small country of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 people, at his suggestion. Remember, now, that West Point trained practically as many officers as it does now at a time when there were only four or five millions of people in this country. Since that time we have done very little toward the training of officers. Several officers' schools and much money has been contributed without much effect upon the military training. There were the land-grant colleges, where there was really no actual military training. In 1861-62 the cry was the dearth of officers. So important was the defect in our system that it was Mr. Morrill who introduced the land-grant-college act and passed it. There was to be a way to educate officers for the Army. It did not have the effect that was expected of it. It was too late for that war. For a short time after that war the subject was talked about a good deal in the newspapers, but nothing was done, and when the Spanish War came on exactly the same result followed—that we were short of officers. It was talked about, but nothing was done. About 18 months ago I introduced a bill which provided as follows: That there should be established in each one of the 48 States a military training academy after the fashion of West Point, to be under the general auspices of the State and the Nation.

After examining into many military schools and finding out the cost of keeping a student there, it was believed that the sum of \$400 to each student would be enough to keep him and maintain him at that college during the scholastic year, house him, clothe him, feed him, educate him, and train him for that service, the Government to bear two-thirds of it and the State to bear the rest. The State legislature was to select under the terms of the bill the college or institution that was to receive the benefits of the act. These students were to be selected by counties. The county superintendent of education was to hold the examination just exactly as we Congressmen now hold examinations for selection of students for West Point. And when they were selected and accepted by the institutions, why, they were to be educated and trained, the United States Government furnishing the officers which were to do the military training and the local institutions that had been selected by the State to receive the benefit of the act to furnish the educational training, the college training, as it were, all without cost to the boy, except this, that the boy was to agree in writing that he would serve the Government at any time that he was called upon within a period of seven years after his graduation. In that length of time there would be built up a reserve of young Army officers of about 33,000, and, of course, the matter being a continuing one, why, as the seven years would expire on one set it would come in on the other, and we would have a continuing reserve of about 33,000 of these young officers.

Our military experts state that in the event of trouble about 30,000 officers would be necessary. Now, that is the substance of my bill. It was referred to the War Department, and that

department returned on the bill that it was a good one, but the then present War Department had their plans and it would not make any recommendation about it at all. After the war broke out last summer I was sent for by the department and was told that, with certain inconsequential modifications, if the bill were sent back the War Department would recommend it, as it was realized it was just exactly what was wanted under our system. It was sent back. The small changes were made. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House has considered it a number of days, given it the most careful consideration, amended it, reported it to this House, and it is now on the calendar. And it is to that bill I wish to speak.

Now, I am not one of those who believe we are likely to get into war at any time. I am not one of those who are easily thrown off their feet by fear or fright or anything of that kind. But if you gentlemen will consider the terms of this bill you will see that it does two great things. It provides for a reserve corps of officers, which is absolutely necessary in the event of defense. It provides them at a very small cost. It provides them without any interference with our established institutions, either State or National. The State absolutely controls these institutions, except in so far as the military training is concerned. The Federal Government furnishes two-thirds of the money for them, and furnishes the military training.

What would be the result if this bill as recommended by the committee should pass? It would mean that the United States Government and the several State governments would graduate, when they are all in operation, some 30,000 of these young men every year without cost to these young men. It fills a need that is said to exist by our military experts. At the same time it does something that the United States Government has never yet done. It contributes largely to the education of our young men. I say that under no circumstances could this bill if enacted into law be a mistake. In the first place, our military experts say that it is necessary. In the next place, the cost is inconsequential. In the next place, we give one of the best kinds of education to about 15,000 young men every year free of cost. While it is free of cost to them, it is not a gratuity at all, because they have to give something up. What is it? They have got to contract for their services in the event of trouble. Now, is not that—I want to appeal to you gentlemen, and I greatly regret there is not a larger membership here this afternoon, because I think this is a very important matter—is not that a safe and sane way to build up our national defenses? Is it not better than spending immense sums on experimenting, for I want to say to you gentlemen you do not experiment when you educate our youths.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. How many instructors does the gentleman think it would require to adequately instruct those 15,000 young men each year?

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, I imagine there should not be less than one or no more than two of these instructors at each institution.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. I have an interest in what the gentleman is saying; but is it not the practice now in these land-grant institutions to have military discipline and drill and education, and upon the graduation of members of the college to give them a potential rank which would be recognized by the Government in event of war? And does the gentleman know how many of these men are graduated each year and given the status of potential officers, if we may use that term?

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, practically very few are given the status of potential officers, to use the gentleman's expression. As a matter of fact, these land-grant colleges under the terms of the Morrill Act are very loose military institutions. They drill once or twice a week. They drill just enough to get the appropriation from the National Government. Now, that is all there is in that. By the terms of this bill I do not interfere with those colleges at all, for this reason, that since I have been in this House I have never interfered with any educational project; and as long as the Government is contributing to these land-grant colleges, I look upon it not as a military feature that we ought to uphold but as an educational feature that we ought to uphold. I believe that the Government can do no better under any circumstances than to educate the youth of our land.

Mr. SLOAN. Is it not a fact that the Government does furnish to the institutions concerning which we are talking a representative from the Army to supervise the military education, especially in the larger institutions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Only in certain of the institutions, because the President is limited only to 30 officers that he can

assign under the law to these colleges; and, of course, you can easily see that these are not sufficient. Now, under the terms of this bill that provision of the law which limits it to 30 is repealed and the President can assign such officers to these colleges that are to be established by the bill that I have introduced as he may see fit.

Now, I want to explain to the gentleman, if he will excuse me a moment or two—

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will tell you why these land-grant colleges do not effect the purpose. The National Government has not control of them. If they give one week's pretended effort at military instruction, they are entitled to the appropriation. The Government has no control over them at all, and for that reason our military authorities and the War Department say that they are not a practical benefit.

Now, under the system that we would have, a board composed of three men—the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and a civilian member appointed by the President—would have absolute control of this much of the institution: It would have to come up to the military requirements before they can get the \$80,000 that is allotted to it, and for that reason the academics that we seek to establish by this bill are directly interested in meeting the requirements; because, of course, whoever has the purse strings has control of that feature of the institution. The institution that has been selected can not get the appropriation unless it meets the requirements of the Government, in so far as the military training is concerned.

Now, I want to say that this bill has been carefully gone over and—

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will take pleasure in yielding to my friend.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman explain the character of the examination that gives eligibility to the appointee and then the character of the curriculum, and say to what extent it is a classical course?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will explain about that. I want to say as to the selection of these boys that they are required to be selected geographically. They are required to be selected from every county in every State in the Union. Of course there will be some States that have fewer counties than others, and there will be more boys from some States on that account than from others; but they must be selected by the local county superintendents, who will hold competitive examinations and give every boy an appointment who meets the requirements. It is not confined to those who may be powerful or rich. The poor boy has an equal chance with the rich boy, and under the terms of this bill the country boy has just as good or even a better chance than the city boy.

It ought to appeal to every Member here who believes in education and who believes in the actual defense of his country. This bill ought to appeal to them.

Now, that is the method of selection. It is purely upon a merit basis. It leaves out no part of our country. It leaves out no part of our people. It is a chance for a deserving, ambitious boy, wherever he may live, to receive a splendid college education.

Now, what was the other question the gentleman asked?

Mr. HULINGS. About the course, the students' course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, the local institution provides that, of course. I have no doubt but that in the State of Virginia the Virginia Military Institute would be the one that would probably be selected by that State to receive the benefits of the act. Of course it has its own curriculum and makes its own terms for admission, and, in my judgment, that is one of the attractive features of the scheme, that the local institution of each State prescribes the terms of admission upon which students may be admitted to the college. At the same time its control of the matter is not final or absolute in anything except education, because they have got to train these boys from a military standpoint with the utmost care upon such conditions and attainments and such instruction as the National Government prescribes, because if they do not they can not get the \$80,000 as applied to that particular State.

Now, I was much in hope that we could get this bill passed at this session of Congress, where we have had so much discussion about our coast defenses and so many differences about this experiment and that experiment. I have no doubt but that we will be prepared to meet any emergency along that line. We shall have the necessary ammunition if we ever get into trouble. But it is perfectly apparent to anyone who will think of it that we must have trained officers. Here we can get them at

small cost. Here we can get them by doing the greatest good to mankind that Congress ever did to the youth of our land. So far as I am concerned, I would a thousand times rather appropriate money to so educate the youth of our land so as to equip them to make good soldiers of themselves and avoid unnecessary suffering than to give pensions indiscriminately to those who sometimes suffer in war for the want of such training. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the fortification and the battleship, in proportion to their cost and relative importance in defense and offense, seem to have made a poor figure in the present European war. The fortification is said to collapse, even evaporate, at the touch of a shell from a 42-centimeter gun, and the battleship is reputed to seek a place of safety or to sink from a thrust from under the sea.

In the din of the great amount of talk indulged in here about armies and armaments and the glory of war, the infinite superiority of the instruments and the products of the arts of peace are lost to sight and sense. We all know that war is a disgrace except in self-defense, and then it impeaches the moral status and the sanity of the nation that imposes the necessity for such defense.

We hardly comprehend the gravity of our relation to the war that is now going on. Rome after Cannæ had no worse outlook, and Carthage after Zama had no more fateful prospect than is now held out in the horoscope of civilization. The daily disasters in Europe are only digging deeper the pit in which to bury the happiness of the human race. And yet the sulphurous fumes and the ghastly sights of the battle field seem to exhilarate instead of disgusting men. Physical courage is a good thing, but it is nothing to brag about, for it is common even among the four-footed beasts. Men pretend that we need to have war in order to prove that we are brave. Americans have shown on a thousand fields of carnage that they have courage of the first quality, and they have shown it so well that the world will never forget it. There are nobler fields of action and higher ambitions than to make and conduct human slaughterhouses.

If the worse than wasted wealth that has been thrown away on war had been applied to education in industry, in utilities, in science, and in art, there would not to-day be a single unhappy human being on earth. A statesmanship that can get for the people whose destinies it directs and controls only the arbitrament of the sword and the cannon and the torch is a reflection and a slam on the science of politics and government among men in this age. Here on this floor a fortnight ago a learned, captivating, and martial gentleman, radiating sentiments of Tyrian hue, said luridly and alliteratively that he would a thousand times rather scream with the eagle than pipe with the piping pigeon of peace, or words equally terrifying on the one hand and contemptuous on the other.

Force, reason, and moral susceptibility we all concede are the chief springs and agencies of government. The first, force, is the surest and best where no regard is paid to human rights. The second, reason, is hampered where intelligence is rare and ignorance is general. The third, moral susceptibility, is enfeebled by indifference and paralyzed when the eagle screams.

In the light of these last six months in Europe, civilization does not present an interesting or alluring prospect. The action of the times has the color and the odor and the earmarks of the age of Nero, the Roman Emperor, or of the days of Alaric, King of the Visigoths. How shall we show our appreciation of our situation in regard to this? We talk endlessly and excitedly about war, and about the value of it and the duty of it, but are we equal to what we ought to do now? There are few, if any, of us here in whose veins does not flow the blood of one or another of the nations now involved in the most stupendous conflict that ever reddened and blackened the face of the earth. At such a time it were unworthy to speak of anything other than the hopes and the fears of our stupefied, mystified, horrified race. Well-ordered government obtained in those great States and prevailed so long, the serenest confidence pervaded the civilized world that peace and progress attended them, that the rights and security of their peoples were firmly established, and that they, with us, would lead mankind to the realization of its highest destiny.

There has been a rude awakening from this complacent dream, for Europe is aflame with war and civilization itself is in jeopardy of obliteration. We have learned that to be prepared for war does not insure peace, but rather induces the pre-

cupitation of strife. We seek to know the cause of this fury and persistent rage and devastation. Does it show that our civilization is a mere veneer? Is it a case of reversion to type, as of the well-trained canine to the vulpine pack? Is there a reasonable, tangible, appreciable cause for this shedding of seas of blood and covering a continent with gloom and horror? Men wish to know. Men believe it is the acme of the prejudice, the ambition, and the opportunism which have darkened the world with war from the beginning of time—war that paralyzes progress, that submerges civilization, that yields only death and desolation. The old Roman told it all when he said, "Inter arma silent leges"—in the midst of arms the laws are silent. Not only are the civil laws but all laws are suspended, save those devoted to the concentrated and convulsive energy of destruction. War—the opportunity of the plunderer, of the violator, of the spoiler; the keenest curse and blackest blight that can come to the man who works, for he must pay the cost. He must do the suffering and the dying. It is his family that is dissolved in tears and sunk into poverty and despair. [Applause.] War! You talk of war, that has loaded civilization with fifty thousand million dollars of debt, upon which it is now paying the interest. And yet every Christian nation is in a frenzy of haste to make more arms of precision, engines of destruction, charnel-house battleships, so as to be exquisitely prepared, instantaneously ready, at the turn of the word or the drop of the hat, to maim, mangle, destroy, and desolate their fellow Christians. [Applause.] All are spurred on by the same madness; no nation can hesitate, or it will be trampled; all must keep the quickstep of the gory procession. Ah, what a civilization. It challenges barbarism for folly, fury, and monstrosity. It is a felonious beggar on horseback, crimson with the blood of innocents, livid with the leprosy of injustice—the price of the pride, the arrogance, the hypocrisy, and the mendacity of the age we have the hardihood to boast. [Applause.]

It is not strange that mankind shudders, stumbles, hesitates, recoils, and retreats since it is the policy of the great States to have their strong young men slain or crippled in battle. War feeds on the stalwart, the high spirited, the best, and discards the ruck of the race that can bestow nothing upon posterity but an enfeebled progeny to eke out wretched, paralytic, and hopeless lives. Who will answer for this immolation, who atone for the wreck of nations? What is the philosophy and where is the statesmanship of it? There is none. It is a colossal fraud and a hideous crime. [Applause.] The Modoc, the Malay, and the maniac could do no worse in government than civilization is doing to-day.

Have intelligence and moral sensibility stood still, made no advance since the dire days of Attila? Is the lust for material dominion and despotic control of aliens a sign, a token, an evidence of culture, of mental elevation and equilibrium and of psychic perfection?

Does man differ from the beast of the jungle only in the stronger desire and better facility to inflict pain, perpetrate ruin, and magnify and multiply woe? Must all energy, industry and invention be devoted to armies for defense or to slaughter for conquest? To what baleful, doleful pass has our vaunted progress brought us, and what have our freedom, our schools, and our churches done for us if we must forever burden the people with the necessity to prepare to destroy and to desolate their fellow men? Is it true that "judgment hath fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason"? Can not we believe that this unprecedented, this unholy, this world war will result in universal and permanent peace, through exhaustion and the aversion its hecatombs of victims will beget against the massacre of nations? [Applause.]

Can we not hear above the clangor of battle, above the roar of the conflagration of cities, the moans of the aged, the shrieks of violated women, and the screams of orphaned children the voice of reason resounding from the confines of the great Republic?

Will it not inspire a new song that all the world will sing, in which the refrain of the chorus will ring, "Away with class and privilege and war and slaughter. Hail to peace and faith among the nations and the dawn of the reign of common sense." [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday and again to-day some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have renewed the talk of prosperity. I am not criticizing them for it. In fact, they command my admiration. When I remember that in 1914 there were more business failures than in any other year in the history of the country; that business is further below normal than ever before; that

there are more closed mills and factories to-day than ever before; that the difference between the receipts and expenditures are larger to-day than ever before; and that there are more bread lines and soup houses in this country than ever before, we can not but admire our friends when they talk about prosperity.

My distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] had some remarks to make this morning about prosperity, and I wondered whether his mail is anything like mine. I want to read a few extracts from some things that came to me to-day through the mail. First, I refer to what appeared on the first page of the Washington Post yesterday morning, which reads as follows:

PLAN HUGE WAGE CUT—52 RAILROADS IN THE EAST UNITE FOR THE CAMPAIGN—750,000 MEN ARE AFFECTED—REPLY TO ENGINEER BROTHERHOOD'S THREAT TO DEMAND INCREASE.

NEW YORK, February 20, 1915.

The railroads of the eastern territory have entered a campaign for a reduction this spring in the pay of employees from engineers down to trackmen.

This will affect the earnings of about 750,000 men and a pay roll approximating \$600,000,000 per annum.

Fifty-two railroads are identified with the movement, and the territory covered by these lines lies east of Chicago, and, roughly, is that for which an increase in freight rates has recently been granted.

Next I desire to read extracts from the Daily Iron Trade, a journal published in Cleveland, Ohio, from the edition of Friday, February 19, 1915:

MUCH SURPRISED AT VOTE'S RESULT—MILL OWNERS AND UNION OFFICERS WERE CHAGRINED—SHEET MILL CONCERNS BY REPRESENTATIVES ARE TALKING OVER SITUATION AT PITTSBURGH.

PITTSBURGH, February 19.

Middle western sheet and tin-plate manufacturers are holding a meeting here to-day in the endeavor to solve a complicated situation made so by the unexpected total rejection of the proposed reduced wage schedules by their employees. The proposed rate sanctioned by the officers of the Amalgamated Association, with which these employees are affiliated, provided an 11.2 per cent reduction for sheet-mill men and 6 per cent cut for tin-mill men, based upon sliding scales.

Then, in the same issue of the paper, I read the following:

RECEIVER NAMED—LA FOLLETTE IRON CO. TURNED OVER TO NEIL ROBINSON, OF CHARLESTON.

CINCINNATI, February 19.

A receiver has been named for the La Follette Iron Co., La Follette, Tenn., in the person of Neil Robinson, a coal operator of Charleston, W. Va., who has been receiver of the La Follette Coal, Iron & Railway Co. for about one year.

Next I read an extract from the Washington Star of February 20, 1915, which is as follows:

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED MEN LOSE JOBS—STEEL MILLS AT GRANITE CITY, ILL., CLOSE FOR INDEFINITE PERIOD.

GRANITE CITY, ILL., February 20.

The steel mills here will close to-day for an indefinite period. The order closing the plants will throw more than 2,500 men out of work.

Several days ago a majority of the members of the Amalgamated Association of Steel, Iron and Tin Workers in Granite City voted to accept a cut in wages rather than have the plants closed down. The reduction, however, was not approved by the national organization and the men were ordered to demand their regular wage. This the general manager of the company announced he was not able to pay and issued the closing order.

Then, in order that I may get to all sections of the country, I have here an article from one of the newspapers of the South. I read now a clipping taken from the Gulfport Daily Herald, and I believe that Gulfport is the home of my distinguished friend from Mississippi, Mr. HARRISON: This is an interview with one Hugh McManus, and my correspondent says that he was for many years sheriff of that county. He has just recently visited Birmingham, and here is a report he made when he got home. I suppose it is safe to presume that he is a Democrat, if he has been elected sheriff down there for several terms. The article is as follows:

M'MANUS RETURNS FROM BIRMINGHAM.

After spending three days in Birmingham, Hugh McManus returned home yesterday afternoon. During his meanderings around the city Mr. McManus says he saw vast gatherings of people, and inquiring the reason for such assemblages he was told that they were meeting the train of soup wagons on their rounds, which has been sent out for the benefit of the destitute by the city authorities. It is hard to exaggerate the conditions of the working class in the mineral district of Alabama, declared Mr. McManus, and there are many young men formerly filling clerical positions in the larger stores there who are now cutting wood or performing other menial labor for 75 cents a day.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that it is only a state of mind that exists in Birmingham to-day. Next I will go over to the Pacific coast, and in order to give some of my Democratic friends an opportunity to get off that very witty saying about my having the shingles, I am not going to refer to shingles, but I am going to read from a letter which I hold in my hand, from one of the leading lumbermen of the Pacific coast. He calls my attention to a letter which he incloses and from which I will read a sentence or two:

Canadian import tariff effective to-day imposes a duty of 7½ per cent at mill value of lumber, rough and dressed, cross-ties, switch ties, and other articles. This is an addition to the tariff previously in effect on dressed lumber.

That shows how Canada is taking care of her lumbermen. In commenting upon that my correspondent says:

The attached copy of letter from the general purchasing agent of the Grand Trunk Railway system, with headquarters at Montreal, Quebec, was received in our office this morning, and is self-explanatory.

There never has been any duty on rough lumber from the States into Canada. Heretofore we have enjoyed a fairly lucrative trade with the railways, shipping, of course, rough lumber only, such as ties and timbers. Since the tariff into this country has been removed a great deal of lumber has been shipped from British Columbia into the States, and now, since the Canadian Government sees fit to put a duty on lumber, so as to prevent any possibility of our shipping into their territory, it certainly is doing just what the lumber manufacturer needs in British Columbia. Sad to relate, our Government seems blind to the necessity of the lumbermen of the coast and elsewhere. As you know, it is absolutely impossible now to charter vessels for any cargo trade. This situation, together with the railways being unable to buy any material, has demoralized the lumber industry on the coast beyond description.

Unless the European difficulties are settled within a very short time, the lumber industry here will be bankrupt. We certainly have been unjustly dealt with on the tariff question by the present Congress. I must say this, in spite of the fact that I cast my first presidential vote for Grover Cleveland and my last one for Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The correspondent of the gentleman must have made a mistake when he said it was impossible to charter vessels. Evidently the gentleman did not read that portion into the Record as a part of his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly I did; and the reason you can not get cargoes—

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was saying that there were more vessels than business.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do not want the gentleman, in the language of the street, to "butt in" in the middle of a sentence. I am willing to yield to him at any time in an orderly way.

The reason why you can not get cargoes is that, notwithstanding your party platform—and I was in hopes that you would not say anything about that, so that I would not have to refer to your party platform again, for I have some consideration for your feelings and I do not like to refer to it—the reason is that you forgot your party platform promises about the Panama Canal and have imposed \$1.50 a thousand upon every thousand feet of lumber that goes through the Panama Canal to the Atlantic coast from the Pacific. That is the reason why we can not get vessels, and that is what he had in his mind. There would have been American vessels sufficient for this trade if the canal had been left free for them.

Mr. BORLAND. That is not what he said.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No. If the gentleman will ask me properly, I will yield; but hereafter, if he does not, I shall decline to yield. Although this gentleman is a Democrat, he knows what he is talking about, and I wish I could say that much always about my friend from Missouri when he is talking on the tariff question. I have other articles here—so many that I hardly have the hardihood to read them all—but this one I will read:

WATCH BUSINESS HARD HIT—THE SETH THOMAS CLOCK CO. TO CLOSE GREATER PART OF ITS THOMASTON PLANT.

The Seth Thomas Clock Co., employing 400 hands has closed the greater part of its plant here because, as it states in a posted notice: "Trade conditions in the watch business have been very bad and are steadily growing worse. There is practically no demand for watches," continues the notice, "and we are no longer able to continue the manufacture of watches which we can not sell. We are very sorry to close the greater part of our watch shop until the market conditions improve." To the employees the announcement does not come wholly unexpected, as a large number have been laid off during the past six months and those who have been retained have been working only about 40 hours a week.

Then, turning to another one headed "Tariff to blame," it says:

TARIFF TO BLAME.

The placing of 3,000 employees of the Waltham Watch Co. on short time has resulted from the business depression in the United States induced by the tariff changes, and not because of the interference with the company's foreign business because of the European war, according to Vice President Conover Fitch, of the company. Mr. Fitch is quoted as saying:

"We have been obliged to reduce the number of working hours in our establishment because of the extreme depression in this country. That the depression here in our business is due partly to the effects of the European war is undoubtedly true, but in my opinion it is mainly due to the change in tariff and policies of government and consequent general depression, which was being felt seriously before the outbreak of the European war. It is a fact that Swiss manufacturers are taking advantage of the reduced tariff duties and loss of European markets to flood this country with their products regardless of price."

Then I have one, "Business conditions—Dividend one-third of those in 1913." This gives a long list of the different steel companies and their earnings, as compared with last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting

some 25 or 30 more illuminating illustrations of the business prosperity we now enjoy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BUSINESS CONDITIONS—DIVIDENDS ONE-THIRD THOSE OF 1913.

Net earnings of the Republic Iron & Steel Co., applicable on the \$25,000,000 preferred shares, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1914, were \$1,028,748, equivalent to 4.12 per cent, as compared with \$3,101,300, or 12.4 per cent, last year. The Republic Co. has experienced its full share of the depression ruling in the iron and steel trade. Chairman John A. Topping, in his remarks to stockholders, states the year was decidedly the worst in the history of the company as to prices and demand, although earnings were considerably above previous periods of depression, due to lower costs as a result of improved facilities and other economic influences. Wages of employees, however, were not reduced. Commenting upon the unsatisfactory condition of the iron and steel business last July, Chairman Topping said: "The earnings of the company for the six months' period ended June 30, 1914, emphasize the general effect on business resulting from tariff reductions and trade hesitation incident to the enactment of new laws and the discussion of radical legislation."

FEBRUARY DIVIDEND PAYMENTS.

According to the Journal of Commerce, the dividend payments for February this year will be \$8,164,392 less than those of February, 1914. The decrease in industrial companies will be over \$6,000,000. A summary of the February dividends, with comparisons for the same month a year ago, follows:

	1915	1914	Shrinkage.
			Per cent.
Industrials.....	\$25,111,873	\$31,778,216	26
Steam railroads.....	19,938,336	21,323,236	7
Street railways.....	3,814,363	3,927,512	3
Total.....	48,864,572	57,028,964	17

SEVERE BUSINESS DEPRESSION.

The severity of the business depression of 1914 is emphasized by the annual reports of the great steel manufacturing plants of the country of their operations during the past year. The United States Steel Corporation reported for the last quarter of the year the smallest earnings of its career and was forced to pass the dividend on its common stock.

The showings made by some of these companies last year are the unanswerable argument against the present low-tariff system. They represent the harvest reaped from the enactment of the many antibusiness laws and the discussion of radical legislation. Net results of several companies, as set forth by the Daily Iron Trade last week, were as follows:

The Cambria Steel Co. earned 4.36 per cent on its outstanding capital in 1914, which was only 31 per cent on its 1913 earnings of 13.8 per cent on its capital. Its November and February dividends were declared payable in scrip.

The Republic Iron & Steel Co. earned 4.12 per cent on its preferred stock, as compared with 12.4 per cent the previous year. It passed its September and December dividends.

The American Iron & Steel Manufacturing Co., Lebanon, Pa., withdrew \$206,321 from its undivided profits during the year, according to its balance sheet, which is the only statement it gives out to the public.

The J. G. Brill Co., Philadelphia, car manufacturer, earned 3.47 per cent on its preferred stock, which compares with 19.63 per cent in 1913. Dividends were reduced in November and February from 12 per cent to 1 per cent.

The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. was the one brilliant exception. In its report for the past six months its earnings were at the rate of 7 per cent on preferred and 8 per cent on common.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. also made a better record than the average for the year.

A summing up of current conditions shows a great deal of ground has been gained in the past two months. The Steel Corporation's works are operating on an average of about 60 per cent of capacity; independent plant activities range between 45 and 55 per cent. In the first part of December, when the lowest level was touched from the standpoint of operations, prices, and orders, the steel works' operating average dropped to about 25 to 30 per cent.

ACCEPT WAGE CUT.

Reading Iron Co. puddlers, helpers, and muck-mill hands, by vote of February 6, have decided to continue working at the announced wage reduction of 50 cents a ton for puddling, effective next Monday. The company proposes, as soon as market conditions warrant, puddlers' wages will return to the \$5-a-ton basis. It is stated other employees of the company will accept a proposed wage reduction.

ANOTHER WAGE REDUCTION.

Sheet and tin-plate workmen employed in a dozen independent mills in the Middle West and affiliated with the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, agreed on February 5 to accept a wage reduction from 6 to 11.2 per cent. This agreement affects mills in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, and Missouri. While some of these independent mills have been working at 40 per cent of capacity, it is understood they will add to their working forces immediately.

RAILROAD DEFAULTS IN 1914.

Stocks and bonds of American railroads in receivership were increased by approximately \$200,000,000 in 1914, and the total is now, in the aggregate, more than \$1,200,000,000. Total trackage now in default in this country amounts to 16,104 miles. Last year 22 railroads went into receivers' hands, according to a compilation of Dow, Jones & Co. Their funded debt amounted to \$137,250,300 and their outstanding capital stock totaled \$62,321,000, a grand total of \$199,571,300.

FAILURES IN JANUARY.

The statistics of commercial failures in the United States for January disclose a business mortality far in excess of normal. "The largest

number of failures ever recorded in any month and the seventh largest aggregate of monthly liabilities are evidences that liquidation of crippled commercial concerns went forward apace in January. Total insolvencies for January, as reported to R. G. Dun & Co., reached the unprecedented number of 2,848, and several defaults of unusual size swelled the aggregate indebtedness to \$49,640,575, these figures comparing with 1,857 suspensions for \$39,374,347 in the same period of the preceding year, 1,814 for \$22,972,769 in 1913, 1,814 in 1912 for only \$19,770,530, and but 1,663 four years ago, when the liabilities were \$24,090,649.

MORE MEN ACCEPT WAGE CUT.

The plants of the National Enameling & Stamping Co., in Granite City, Ill., and St. Louis, will begin operations next Monday with a full force working full time as the result of a referendum vote of the ironworkers accepting a cut in wages. The vote, taken Saturday, was announced to-day. More than 3,000 workmen will get jobs under the reduced scale.

The wage scale was to be on a sliding basis, varying with the market price of the factories' products. The cut was necessary, the officers said to-day, owing to the inability of the independent factories to compete with the trust companies under the old scale.

The Bank of North America, one of the leading Philadelphia banks, in its February trade letter says: "During the last half of 1914 the shoe manufacturing business of the country was not better than 60 per cent of normal. The leather business, aided even by the foreign demand, was in scarcely more active state."

Nathan T. Folwell, the president of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, in an interview published in the Philadelphia Public Ledger, February 5, said: "Had there been no European war either there would have been a decided reduction in wages or the mills of my firm, as well as those of other manufacturers similarly situated, would undoubtedly have been forced to shut down as a direct consequence of the tariff reduction put into force by the present Washington administration."

The First National Bank, of Boston, in its New England letter of January 15, 1915, said: "During the past 30 years business sentiment in New England has undergone a change. The optimism which sprang up soon after the outbreak of the war, when it was recognized that the United States had escaped financial disaster, has given way to a less buoyant feeling. Disappointing trade returns furnish ample evidence that in New England general business has gone back in the last few weeks, and the indications are that but little improvement can be expected in the immediate future. The prevailing feeling is that after a few months we can hope for a small and gradual increase in activity, but early relief from the present severe business depression in the shape of anything like normal business is not expected."

Railways operating 228,461 miles of line, or about 90 per cent of all steam railway mileage in the United States, reports operating revenues for the month of November, 1914, amounting to \$238,812,430. This amount includes revenues from freight and passenger traffic, from carrying mail and express, and from miscellaneous sources connected with rail and auxiliary operations. Compared with November, 1913, these operating revenues show a decrease of \$32,836,569. Total operating revenues per mile averaged \$1,023 in November, 1914, and \$1,180 in November, 1913, a decrease of \$157, or 13.3 per cent.

Imports to the United States under the operations of the Underwood tariff law for 10 months—to July, 1914, before the outbreak of the war—increased \$102,478,621, while in the same period duties paid on imports decreased \$30,770,070. The increased importations, amounting to over \$100,000,000, displaced more than an equal amount of American-made goods, and resulted in heavy losses in employment and wages.

The number of persons sheltered in the municipal lodging houses in New York during the mild January of the present year has been steadily over 2,000 a night, and has risen as high as 2,660. This represents an increase of approximately 50 per cent over January of last year, when the weather was very severe during a great part of the month, while the increase over 1912 is very much greater. For the month of December, 1914, the average number cared for at the lodging houses was 1,288, as compared with 479 in December, 1912.

In a city of about 35,000, near New York, a census of the number of skilled workers out of employment was taken during January, 1915. Out of 147 carpenters in the city it was found that 113, or nearly four-fifths, were out of work. Approximately the same condition prevailed among the other trades canvassed. This was not a city having any large individual establishments where the closing of a single mill might throw a large number out of work, and it may be taken therefore as typical of existing conditions.

For the seven months of the calendar year 1914 up to August 1, or preceding the European war, the imports of cloths and dress goods, as compared with the seven months of the previous year, were in value as follows:

Imports.	1914	1913
Cloth (seven months).....	\$10,879,813	\$2,852,052
Dress goods (seven months).....	5,602,943	1,899,275

In the case of cloths this was nearly fourfold and in the case of dress goods threefold the imports of the corresponding months of 1913, which were not much less than the average of the years immediately preceding. The result of the Simmons-Underwood tariff has been to give European manufacturers a greatly increased market in the United States at the expense of American manufacturers without any appreciable reduction in the cost or improvement in the quality of the clothing of the American people. Speaking of the condition of the woolen and worsted industry in New England, the First National Bank of Boston said in one of its New England letters: "Activity in the main New England industries has declined. This is especially true in woolen and worsted manufacturing, nearly one-half of its machinery being now idle, in spite of the receipt of foreign orders. There are two principal reasons for this depressed condition; one is the very great increase in the imports of the foreign goods, which are from two to four times as great as a year ago, and the other factor the large amount of unemployment throughout the country, which affects the ability of the people to buy and wear woolen clothing."

The condition of the steel industry is reflected by the passing by the United States Steel Corporation of its dividend on the common stock for the quarter ending December 31, 1914, the worst three months in the history of the corporation so far as earnings were concerned. Operations of steel plants have been reduced to as low as 40 per cent, and at present are probably not over 55 per cent capacity.

The report of G. M. Haffords & Co. on the earnings of 37 cotton-cloth corporations in Fall River showed an average of 0.903 per cent for the first quarter of 1915—the next to the lowest average on record. The same quarter in 1914 showed an average dividend of 1.23 per cent. The average total dividend for the four quarters of 1914 were 4.239 per cent as compared with 7.29 per cent in 1913 and 10.93 per cent in 1907, the year in which there were also notable stock dividends.

The First National Bank of Boston, in the New England letter of February 16, 1915, says: "While an improvement in sentiment has been developing for several months, it is only within the last few weeks that a betterment in actual trade conditions has been discernible. The advance on the whole is slight, but there have been almost no retrogressions, and distinct progress has been made in several important lines. To be sure, the record of failures for January was the worst on record, and the December losses in railroad gross earnings were startling. These losses were not confined to New England, such roads as the Pennsylvania and the New York Central falling off 13 per cent from the preceding year, six typical southern railroads 19 per cent, and five representative western railroads 12 per cent; nevertheless, in New England informal reports for the New Haven Railroad show the number of cars loaded locally since January 1 to be almost up to the figures of a year ago, while the number of cars loaded elsewhere but entering New England show a slight advance over the same month of the preceding year. Again, bank clearings for January, while they show extreme depression, reflect a somewhat greater volume of commercial and industrial activity. Although there is a tendency to exaggerate the real upward trend of the steel industry, the consensus of opinion seems to be that in the last three months the industry has increased its operating rate from a little under 40 per cent to slightly over 50 per cent of capacity; this means that steel has made a moderate recovery from a condition approaching the desperate to one of pronounced depression."

IDLE CARS.

The total surplus of idle cars as of February 1, 1915, was 227,473 cars, compared with 127,325 cars on November 1, 1914, and 211,960 cars on February 1, 1914. It is probable that had reports been received from the same number of roads in February as in November the total number of idle cars would have been increased by approximately 50,000 to a total of two hundred and seventy-seven thousand-odd. Reports as of February 1, 1915, have been received from 159 roads operating 1,854,150 cars, while figures for November 1, 1914, were furnished by 192 roads operating 2,203,414 cars.

SHOWS BIG LOSS.

The Westinghouse Machine Co. reports to the New York Stock Exchange for the nine months ended December 31, 1914, as follows:

Sales billed.....	\$3,576,399
Cost of sales billed, expenses, depreciation, etc.....	3,631,346
Operating loss.....	54,947
Other income.....	67,141
Total income.....	12,194
Interest charges.....	347,537
Net loss.....	335,342

[Editorial from Daily Iron Trade.]

"AIN'T NO SICH ANIMILE NOWHERE."

"It were a journey like the path to heaven
To help you find them."—Milton.

The road to Tipperary is short and easy compared with the path of the real, genuine, true, disinterested patriot
Who poses as a tariff reformer in Congress.

For now comes the Birmingham Age-Herald—
Published right in the home of the man who lent his name to the last misfit tariff measure—

And
It says:

"The Sixty-fourth Congress will be wise if it revises the tariff, and if it does it in such a way as to give just and proper relief, and at the same time not afford to the Republicans an opportunity to make their old-time high-tariff slogan tell in the next campaign."

Right down in "good old Alabam," U. S. A.

Where they have fought previous tariffs as if it were a war for life,
And where there now is open rebellion and positive conviction that the new tariff wrought a huge injustice to the iron, steel, and sugar industries.

They want it revised—

And done quickly—

Before those horrid Republicans get a chance to make a battle cry

And do it again.

What a real job they will have if they undertake to fix up all the inequalities of this Congress's legislation in the next Congress!

And what wonderful speeches will surely be made by the Democrats themselves!

That is

(Of course)

If they don't invoke

The Reed rules or the Cannon rules to prevent debate in this case, as they did last time.

A great number of Democrats are quite frank in pointing out serious errors in the present tariff law,

While no one really has been pleased—

All are apologetic—

All on the defensive—

No one happy

And if anyone desires to locate a loyal, disinterested defender of the Underwood tariff bill

He would have to spend the rest of his life searching in vain.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER] may also have the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many speeches the other side expects to finish in.

Mr. SHERLEY. There will be but one speech on our side.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, we have had a very interesting discussion this afternoon, and I am sure that the Members of the committee who were present were much instructed by some of the speeches that have been made. We had a talk from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON] on an international court of peace. I am confident that every man in this House would vote to establish a tribunal that would deal fairly with all the nations of the earth and assure universal peace. The gentleman from South Carolina apparently does not believe in preparedness for war. I am not of that class either, but differ from him in that I strongly favor being prepared against war. [Applause.] We have had a very illuminating address from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BAKER], who discussed civilization, and I am sure when we read his speech in the RECORD to-morrow we will take it home and treasure it as one fit to have a place in our libraries.

We have had speeches on the tariff and the business conditions of the country, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] read Washington's Farewell Address, which seemed almost prophetic of this period of our country's history. We have quite generally followed the advice of Washington in our foreign affairs, and it is well for those who are charged with the responsibility of government to-day to bear in mind this masterly address in dealing with the problems of the moment. And we had two good speeches on our national defense by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. As a member of the subcommittee on fortifications of the Committee on Appropriations which prepared this measure, I have no quarrel with either of these gentlemen. I do not agree with them entirely, but I do approve of some of the facts they have stated. Their remarks were very interesting and they imparted some valuable information to the committee. I will not take up all of the subjects they talked about, for I am convinced the very able chairman of the subcommittee on fortifications, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], will make a satisfactory explanation of the bill when the time comes and dispose of any fear on the part of the committee that we have not done our full duty to the country in the report upon this measure. Nobody to-day, except the gentleman from Massachusetts, has discussed any of the items in this measure, and I am going to take the time of the committee for a few moments to explain some of them.

Our coast defenses before the Civil War were in good condition, compared with those of other important nations. The forts were constructed of masonry and were equipped with smoothbore guns. As the result of the Civil War and the war between France and Germany in 1871 many new inventions along the line of armament developed, and, with the improvement in naval vessels both in armor and armament, our fortifications were rendered vulnerable. For many years after the Civil War little was done to better these changed conditions. Boards were appointed by different Secretaries of War, and some improvements were recommended and acted upon, but it was not until the appointment of the Endicott Board in 1885 that a comprehensive investigation of our seacoast defenses was undertaken. As a result of the report of this board a general policy was formulated by the War Department and a report was made to Congress setting forth a scheme of fortifications, which was approved by Congress, and the beginning of the modernizing of the coast defenses was undertaken. The total cost of the fortifications recommended in the report was \$126,377,800, exclusive of ammunition. Large sums of money were appropriated and the work was started.

The action of the Endicott Board was modified, however, materially as the result of the findings of the National Coast Defense Board, otherwise called the Taft Board, which reported to Congress on March 6, 1906. This report estimated that the cost of completing the defenses, including \$6,571,301 for ammunition, would be \$50,879,339. Since the date of the report of the Taft Board there has been appropriated approximately \$10,432,800. Subsequently the project was further changed by the War Department. The latest modifications include a change in the armament for the entrance to Chesapeake Bay at Cape Henry, and provide for the defense of San Pedro Harbor, Cal., and somewhat of a reduction in the quality of armament prescribed for other places. The whole seacoast project to date calls for a total of 1,301 guns and mortars of caliber from 3-inch to 16-inch, inclusive, and of this number 91 per cent have been provided for and are now mounted in our fortifications. There remains to be appropriated for 117 guns and mortars. It is estimated that it will require an appropriation of \$40,000,000 to complete our seacoast defenses. The basis of the ammunition supply for continental United States is the provision of a sufficient quantity to carry through a two-hour engagement one-half the total number of guns manned in the forts. Of this amount we have on hand 73 per cent.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield for one moment there?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. That is 73 per cent of the supply for the guns already provided for, is it not, and not for the whole project?

Mr. CALDER. I am under the impression, although I may be wrong, that it is 73 per cent of the entire project.

Mr. GARDNER. It is only 66 per cent of the entire project.

Mr. CALDER. Yes; the gentleman is right.

Mr. GARDNER. I have the letter from the Secretary of War.

Mr. CALDER. The amount of ammunition on hand and appropriated for is 73 per cent of the amount required for the guns and mortars now in place; and that does seem a small quantity. The testimony of Gens. Crozier and Weaver before the committee agrees that this is not sufficient, and I am in accord with them. I will say frankly to this committee that if the War Department had asked for a larger appropriation for this item it would meet with my approval. But gentlemen should not be unnecessarily alarmed at the amount of ammunition for our seacoast defenses.

When one stops to consider the extent of our fortifications it can readily be understood that no condition could prevail that would entail but a very small number of our guns being engaged at the same time. No one suggests that we are going to fire all of the guns and mortars in the country on the exact moment. I am sure, however, as the result of the information obtained in the hearings this year and the agitation on the subject, that the War Department will come to Congress in the next session with a request for a substantial increase. Although I will not be a Member of the next Congress, and unable to vote for this increase, I am sure that the fortifications committee will agree that this particular item should be substantially enlarged. In our insular possessions the ammunition supply provided is double the reserve for the United States. Whether or not that is a sufficient amount is a question for the War Department itself to determine. The committee, in presenting this bill this year, has given exactly what the War Department asked for.

Our seacoast defenses generally are in good condition. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] have in their remarks dealt with the range of the large guns. I agree with them that the range of these guns is not great enough to meet the 15-inch guns on some of the newer superdreadnaughts of England and Germany, which are claimed will reach 21,000 yards. The War Department believes, however, that with the appropriation asked for and recommended by the committee the department will be able to alter the carriage and powder chambers of the 12 and 14 inch guns in both our continental and insular possessions, so that their range will be sufficiently increased to keep off the attack of any of the warships above referred to. I might add that it is the intention of the War Department, in the new fortifications and in any changes in the present fortifications, to locate batteries of 16-inch guns, with a range exceeding that of any warship afloat or contemplated.

Now, our field-artillery ammunition—

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CALDER. I do.

Mr. GARDNER. Before the gentleman gets off the subject of our coast fortifications I will say that I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Sun of February 6, in which it is reported that a discussion had arisen in the committee as to whether or not warships could lie off Rockaway Beach and bombard any part of the city of New York. Is it true that there was a general discussion in the committee, which does not appear in the hearings, as to whether or not Boston and New York and San Francisco were safe?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, in a committee like the Subcommittee on Fortifications, and I assume sometimes in the Naval and Military Committees, matters are discussed informally that very properly ought not to be disclosed to the public gaze. I often feel in reading over these hearings that we have printed much that should not be published. But it has been the policy of the committees of Congress to quite thoroughly examine witnesses from the Army and Navy and obtain all proper information. In my two years' service on the Fortifications Committee many subjects have been informally discussed by witnesses and members of the committee.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, if we lost all our Navy; if we had no howitzers to place on the beach at Rockaway; if we had no mines to plant to take care of the ships of hostile countries

in time of war; if we broke down completely in our defensive operations and the water off Rockaway Beach proves deep enough to permit a foreign fleet to come within firing range, it would be possible that the menace suggested by the newspaper article referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] might occur. In connection with the statement that the gentleman quotes I am free to say that the possibility of shelling New York City and other cities of the country was discussed. But for my part—and I think I share the opinion of the committee—we felt as the result of our investigations on this subject that the people of New York have no reason to be unnecessarily alarmed.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, I call the attention of the gentleman to Gen. Weaver's evidence, on page 64, where he says:

It is true that there are certain places—very few of them—where it will probably be necessary to provide additional armaments to prevent the distant bombardment of cities.

Is New York one of those places?

Mr. CALDER. The defenses of New York City were referred to. Answering the gentleman's question further, I would say that if we lost control of the sea, if we had no guns to place on Rockaway Beach and had no mines to plant, there would be a risk.

Mr. GARDNER. I see from the newspaper article that the reason given why New York was safe was because the water off Rockaway Beach was so shallow. Now, I have in my hand a map showing the soundings off Rockaway Beach, and I find that within a mile of the beach there is perfectly good water at a depth of from 5½ to 5½ fathoms. If it is not true that that was the reason why Brooklyn could not be attacked from off Rockaway Beach, then it is not true that it was on account of the shallowness of the water.

Mr. CALDER. If the depth of water off Rockaway is sufficient to permit battleships to come as near the beach as the gentleman indicates, no doubt proper steps would be taken in time of war to protect the city.

Mr. GARDNER. May I ask the gentleman if it is practicable to strew mines along the coast without having any fortifications to reach the mine fields?

Mr. CALDER. Well, I am not an Artillery officer, neither am I a technical expert on the subject of mines; but I will say to the gentleman that as to the possibility of defenses along Rockaway Beach I have not very much fear of New York City being attacked. Even if an attempt were made I doubt if they could seriously injure us.

Now, we are not at war with any great nation, and we are not likely to be, and I feel very confident that long before we could be involved the War Department, which is familiar with this subject, would take the necessary measures in the premises. I have discussed this problem with the officials of the War Department, and I know they have it under serious advisement.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, one moment more. The gentleman is very candid and very lucid. Of course, if there is not going to be any war we need not have any fortifications at all, but if it is all to be as smooth sailing as the gentleman says why was not that whole conversation reported in the hearings?

Mr. CALDER. I repeat. Very often in the Committee on Appropriations, or its subcommittee on fortifications—and I assume in other committees of like character in the House—conversations are held regarding fortifications in different parts of the country.

In preparing this bill at the last session of Congress we discussed very freely the condition of the fortifications in the Philippines and Hawaii without having it recorded in the hearings. I will say frankly to the gentleman that at my solicitation the Secretary of War has taken all of these matters under advisement with reference to the seacoast defenses of New York City, and after a thorough investigation if, in his judgment, it is believed additional fortifications are necessary he has agreed to come to the House at the next session and make such recommendations as he thinks proper. The responsibility now rests with him.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. LEVY. My colleague will not deny that our great Navy, which is the second largest in the world, could amply protect the city of New York, and no other warships could come near enough to bombard that great metropolitan city without being annihilated by our Navy.

Mr. CALDER. I do not doubt it.

Mr. LEVY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss for a moment the condition of our field-artillery ammunition. In

this bill we appropriate \$1,160,000. In the Army bill we appropriated \$2,900,000 for the purchase of additional field ammunition. These two items together will increase our reserve supply from 31 per cent to 48 per cent of the whole project. When I say the whole project I mean based on a mobile army of 450,000 men, and figuring on 3½ guns to every 1,000 infantry and cavalry men. At the present rate of appropriation enough reserve ammunition to provide for this entire project will be on hand within a period of four years. It is estimated it will cost \$16,500,000 to manufacture the balance of the ammunition called for.

The appropriation in this bill for our mountain, field, and siege cannon is \$450,000. There is also an item of \$2,090,000 for field artillery in the Army bill, which makes a total of \$2,540,000 appropriated this year for our mountain, field, and siege guns. We have now on hand 1,000 machine guns and 213 batteries equalling 850 guns out of a total of 1,292 guns. It is estimated that this project is within six years of completion. In my judgment, our field artillery and field ammunition are in excellent shape. The Chief of Ordnance testified in the hearings before the committee that when we have this entire project complete, both as to artillery and ammunition, that if we were called upon to place a mobile army of 450,000 or even larger in the field we would have no difficulty in maintaining an ample supply.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much discussion here and other places about the character of our field artillery and ammunition as compared with that of the countries engaged in the European war. We have been repeatedly asked what lesson have we learned from that war. We have read in the newspapers of the terrible havoc of the 42-centimeter guns and the other great armaments of the contending nations. Your committee questioned closely the officers who appeared before us as to what information they had obtained as to the character of the guns and ammunition possessed by the countries engaged. We were advised that the knowledge so far secured would not warrant them in making any modification of their program for the field artillery and ammunition. When the reports of the officers now abroad are made and finally considered it is possible the War Department may desire to make some change in their plans. I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that we have no land fortifications in this country that would require the character of guns used by the contending countries. We are at peace with our neighbor, Canada, on the north, and neither Canada nor the United States have fortifications on the border. Mexico on the south is too weak to cause any concern.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that this bill does not deal with the question of the personnel of the Coast Artillery. If it did, I would insist that it carry a provision for a substantial increase in this service. In 1907 Congress fixed the number of Coast Artillery companies at 170, with a total of 701 officers and 19,321 enlisted men. It was estimated that this number was a meager requirement for the defenses of the United States alone. There have, up to the present time, been abstracted from the coast line of the United States proper for manning over-sea fortifications the following:

	Companies.
For the Philippine Islands.....	11
For Hawaii.....	8
For the Panama Canal.....	6
Total.....	25

In the near future it will be necessary to take additional companies from the United States, making the total number taken:

	Companies.
For the Philippine Islands.....	24
For Hawaii.....	13
For Panama.....	12
Total.....	49

Leaving in the United States 121 companies. The shortage of Coast Artillery troops for the United States proper is, therefore, at the present time so far below the requirements as to make it deserving of the serious consideration of Congress. The statement I have made above is the testimony of the Chief of Coast Artillery, who also calls attention to the necessity of Congress providing for the authority to increase the enlistment of master electricians, electrician sergeants, engineers, and firemen whose services are necessary in the proper manning of our improved coast defenses. I am sure that it is very important that Congress take up at an early date the question of adding to the Coast Artillery force the men asked for by the chief of this service. We can manufacture guns and ammunition, we can build displacements, but well-trained men thoroughly equipped to handle the delicate mechanism of our guns and mortars can not be obtained at a moment's notice. This is the most impor-

tant branch of the service, and I regret that in passing the Army bill no provision was made to increase this force.

Last week our attention was called to the fact that it was 17 years since the battleship *Maine* was destroyed in Havana Harbor. When war came as a result, it was fought under conditions of unpreparedness that made our concentration camps more deadly to our soldiers than the bullets of the enemy. The system adapted to the needs of an Army of 25,000 broke down utterly as its task was suddenly and unexpectedly increased. The sufferings of our patriotic young men, eager to serve their country in her hour of need, the subsequent scandals, and the revelation of our weakness, I regret, has been forgotten.

Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of this legislation the committee having it in charge has voted to give to the War Department substantially every dollar asked for. If the amount is insufficient, the responsibility is theirs. They are charged with the conduct of this branch of our Government. If they had asked for more, I would have voted to give it to them. We decry expenditures for the national defense, and I agree with gentlemen that because of some useless Army camps and naval stations money is wasted. I would call the attention of the committee, however, to the statement of Chancellor Lloyd George in the British House of Commons on Monday of last week. This speech was a revelation to the world of the stupendous cost of modern war. The statement of the chancellor to the effect that the cost of the war to the allies was \$10,000,000,000 a year is startling. What would the opponents of national defense in the United States say to such an expenditure. I do not expect this country to go to war, at least not in the very near future. I believe that the struggle in Europe will leave the contending powers in such a condition that they will have no desire for further trouble. It is true that, judging from the facts surrounding the conditions abroad, our embarrassments are increasing, but I am confident that the common sense of the American people will not tend to create a sentiment that may rush the President off his feet.

I have seldom agreed with the President in his fiscal policies, and not always in his foreign policies, but I shall do what I can to assist him to mollify our people if any efforts are made by unwise men to involve us in this conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I have referred to the \$10,000,000,000 expenditure of the allies. The cost of our national defense for this year is barely 2½ per cent of this amount. After all, is it not better for us to keep ourselves in a state of preparedness, to some degree, at least, if, perchance, out of a clear sky we should be involved in unforeseen conflict. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixty-seven minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It is now nearly 6 o'clock. The gentleman has over an hour remaining, if he consumes it all. It seems to me that under the circumstances that would be running a little too late to-night.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that to-morrow when I address the House I hope to have some data that I have not now on my desk, I shall acquiesce in the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, and I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Houston, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the fortifications appropriation bill (H. R. 21491) and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, submitted a report that the files and papers described in the report of the Secretary of Commerce, House Document 1499, Fifty-third Congress, third session, dated January 16, 1915, were not needed in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which report (No. 1434) was ordered filed.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, for the purpose of printing a bill to establish and maintain a military training school at the Indian school at Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a bill to establish and maintain a military training school at the Indian school at Carlisle. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 18745. An act in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois; and

H. R. 15557. An act for the relief of Anna Miller.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 20562. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 18172. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind.;

H. R. 17982. An act to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisalment;

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 17765. An act to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department;

H. R. 17122. An act for the relief of John Burrows; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 23, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GARNER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21009) to make Van Buren, Me., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisalment, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1431), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 21531) to require railway and other carriers of passengers for hire to establish an interstate rate which shall not exceed the combination of local rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 21532) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching station on Saginaw River in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21533) to establish the Lassen Volcanic National Park in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in the

State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKELLAR: Resolution (H. Res. 742) amending section 2 of Rule VIII of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, in the form of a resolution, to accept the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act of Congress approved by the President May 8, 1915; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of the legislature of the State of South Dakota, in the form of a resolution, to accept the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act of Congress approved by the President May 8, 1915; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULKLEY: A bill (H. R. 21534) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Duggan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 21535) for the relief of the heirs of Peter F. Archer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 21536) granting an increase of pension to John R. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21537) granting a pension to Lee McKinley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 21538) for the relief of the heirs of James Turner, late of Marshall County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island City, N. Y., and members of the American Neutrality League, urging an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Findlay, Belmont, and Van Buren, Ohio, and Portland, Oreg., protesting against legislation abridging freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of citizens of Atlantic City, N. J., relative to case of Harry K. Thaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Papers to accompany a bill for relief of the heirs of Peter F. Archer; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of Peter C. Johnson and others, of Racine, Wis., also Mrs. M. A. Howell and others, of Waukesha, Wis., against House bill 2644, relative to exclusion of certain publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. B. Seigl, C. M. Ryan, C. R. Emery, and others, of Racine, Wis., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring strict American neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOREMUS: Petitions of Caspar Peitz, jr., A. H. A. Loeber, and several hundred other citizens of Detroit, Mich., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of Woman's Missionary Society, Upper South Carolina Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church South, favoring amendment to Constitution prohibiting polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of E. L. Kattman and others, of State of Ohio, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, protesting against the Deitrick amendment to the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of German-Irish Alliance of Passaic County, N. J., favoring strict American neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDQUIST: Petition of F. L. Church and others, of Central Lake, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Memorial of the Evangelical Lutheran St. Paul's Congregation, of Hickory Grove, Nemaha County, Nebr., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of M. J. Allen, William J. Weiner, and 127 others, of Grand Rapids, Mich., against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of German Veleranen Bund of Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of law prohibiting export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of American citizens of Paterson, N. J., favoring strict American neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Protest from Chamber of Commerce of Klamath, Oreg., against change in boundaries of Crater Lake National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce of Santa Ana, Cal., favoring investigation of Victor Valley (Cal.) possibilities by United States Reclamation Service; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolution of Shakespeare Club, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against shipment of American horses to European battle fields; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, communications from Woman's Missionary Society, Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, Cal., and from Earl Haydock, favoring Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, letters from San Antonio Fruit Exchange, Pomona, Cal.; Board of Education, Oakland, Cal.; Sunset Publishing Co., San Francisco, Cal.; Standard Brick Co., Colton, Cal.; and Southwestern Ornamental Iron Works, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the issuing of stamped and printed envelopes by the United States Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., advocating a naval reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.